UNIVERSITY OF MAINE
LIBRARIES

RAYMOND H. FOGLER LIBRARY
ORONO

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/torydemocracy0000will

STUDIES IN HISTORY, ECONOMICS AND PUBLIC LAW

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Volume CXV] [Number 2

Whole Number 257

TORY DEMOCRACY

BY

WILLIAM J. WILKINSON, PH.D.

Professor of History at Colby College

New York
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
SELLING AGENTS
NEW YORK: LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.
LONDON: P. S. KING & SON, LTD.
1925

LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MAINE

COPYRIGHT, 1925
BY
WILLIAM J. WILKINSON

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To

MY WIFE

PREFACE

SINCE writing the following pages the Conservative party has been returned to power with one of the strongest majorities recorded since 1832. In a country where political and social democracy has developed to a very remarkable degree, such a mandate on the part of the British people is not without significance. It shows, among other things, that the Tory or Conservative party is still a potent political organization and that it is capable of adapting itself to the temper and needs of the times. Such, at least, seems to be the opinion of a considerable proportion of the British electorate. This study attempts to give an account of those forces within the party which have democratized its organization, programme and outlook during the past century, and thus have contributed to that vitality which has been displayed so unmistakably in recent days.

The writer has made considerable use of British newspapers, periodicals and the *Parliamentary Debates*. He also has been aided by an examination of much party literature, including leaflets and the various campaign books of the Conservative organization.

Appreciative acknowledgment is made to Mr. P. Cohen and his associate in the library of the National Unionist Association, Mr. G. Kennedy-Skipton, for their services in placing at the author's disposal much helpful material. He is likewise indebted for the courteous attentions shown in the British Museum, where the metropolitan and provincial newspapers were consulted. He wishes more particularly to acknowledge with gratitude the kind interest and assistance of Professors Carlton J. H. Hayes and Robert L. Schuyler, of Columbia University.

WATERVILLE, MAINE, DECEMBER, 1924.

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER I

What is Tory Democracy? 1

CHAPTER II

The Legacy of Disraeli 19

CHAPTER III

Lord Randolph Churchill and the Fourth Party 62

CHAPTER IV

Lord Randolph Churchill (Continued) 104

CHAPTER V

The Fruitage of Tory Democracy 160

CHAPTER VI

The Fruitage of Tory Democracy (Continued) 207

CHAPTER VII

Later Phases of Tory Democracy 234

Bibliography 305

Index 311

CHAPTER I

What is Tory Democracy?

"The principle of Tory Democracy is that all government exists solely for the good of the governed; that Church and King, Lords and Commons and all other public institutions are to be maintained so far, and so far only, as they promote the happiness and welfare of the common people; that all who are entrusted with any public function are trustees, not for their own class, but for the nation at large; and that the mass of the people may be trusted so to use electoral power which should be freely conceded to them as to support those who are promoting their interests. It is Democratic because the welfare of the people is its supreme end; it is Tory because the institutions of the country are the means by which the end is to be attained."—From a letter to the *Times* by Sir John Gorst, February 6, 1907.

Various definitions of Tory Democracy have been advanced not only by the friends and adherents of the movement but by its many detractors as well. As a rule the latter class, naturally enough, have been more critical than friendly in their efforts to explain and interpret its significance. Mr. Labouchere, for instance, once wrote that it seemed to him to be a contradiction in terms; that it was "like talking of a white-black man." [1] He considered it a fraud and a sham.[2] This opinion of a pronounced Radical was shared by an extreme Conservative who characterized Tory Democracy as a mixture of incompatibles. According to this writer who signed himself "A Plain Tory," it was an unreal, hybrid phrase. He pronounced it a triumph of "word mongering" and "sophistry," [3] designed

[1] *Fortnightly Review*, 1906 (vol. 86), p. 895.

[2] The *Forum*, 1890 (vol. 8), p. 532.

[3] *Tory Democracy and Conservative Policy*, by a Plain Tory (London, 1892), p. 38.

for the sole purpose of capturing votes. A similar expression of opinion is to be found in the pages of the *National Review*. Through the medium of an imaginary colloquy between a "Democratic Tory," a "Patriotic Neutral" and an "Unsophisticated Radical" the idea is developed that Tory Democracy is a rather unscrupulous device for the sole purpose of winning elections.[1]

That Tory Democracy was akin to Radicalism is the view presented by Mr. A. A. Baumann in an article entitled "The Truth About Tory Democracy." Tory Democrats, in his opinion, were much the same as Gladstonian Radicals, and if they were consistent they would help defeat the Conservatives who were then in office, and place Mr. Gladstone and his party in power. If the speeches by Lord Randolph Churchill during the early part of the session of 1887 contained the principles of Tory Democracy, "then," in the estimation of Mr. Baumann, "The partition which separated the Tory Democrats from the Gladstonian Radicals" was very thin.[2] Mr. Eustace G. Cecil held much the same view. He maintained that in advocating the extension of the Employers' Liability Act, the adoption of a scheme of democratic local self-government and other reforms, the Tory Democrats were simply appropriating Mr. Chamberlain's radical programme.[3]

The impossibility of serving two masters is the subject of an article on Tory Democracy in the *Standard* which contained some consoling reflections on the defeat of Mr. Forwood, the Tory Democratic candidate in a Liverpool by-election in 1882.[4] Mr. Kebbel was another who was inclined to see in Tory Democracy an element of conflict and

[1] *National Review*, 1885 (vol. 6), pp. 123-133.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1887 (vol. 9), p. 4.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1885 (vol. 6), p. 202.

[4] The *Standard*, Dec. 9, 1882, p. 3.

inconsistency. He would prefer to use the term "popular Toryism" to describe the movement.[1] Another writer has described Tory Democracy as "an organized hypocrisy"[2] and Lord Rosebery in his work on Lord Randolph Churchill has characterized it as an "imposture." He grants that it was "an honest and unconscious imposture but none the less an imposture." In his opinion the phrase served as a convenient label for any one with radical views who happened to be in the Conservative party and did not want to go over to the Opposition. Hence, he described it as "the wolf of Radicalism in the sheep-skin of Toryism."[3]

In Lord Rosebery's volume, which on the whole is a sympathetic account of the career of the most notable exponent of Tory Democracy, the impression is created that opportunism constitutes its most essential characteristic. Such a conclusion is supported by a statement on the part of Lord Randolph Churchill himself, when in a conversation with Mr. Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, he indicated that it was "principally opportunism."[4] Lord Hugh Cecil in a discussion of Lord Rosebery's book has also expressed the view that this phase of Toryism can be attributed to a wise opportunist policy. The reforms of Sir Robert Peel are mentioned by this authority on Conservatism in support of such an opinion.[5] Other instances could have been cited. To "dish the Whigs" was a factor in prompting the Reform Act of 1867. When Lord Randolph Churchill and the Fourth Party opposed Mr. Gladstone's Employers' Liability Act in 1880 and the Franchise Bill of 1884 because they were not sufficiently comprehensive, the same motive was displayed.

[1] *National Review*, 1887 (vol. 8), p. 804.

[2] *Fortnightly Review*, 1912 (vol. 97), p. 221.

[3] Lord Rosebery, *Lord Randolph Churchill* (London, 1906), p. 139.

[4] *Nineteenth Century*, 1906 (vol. 59), p. 407.

[5] *Dublin Review*, 1907 (vol. 140), p. 147.

The spirit of opportunism was in evidence, as Lord Hugh Cecil has pointed out in the article to which reference has been made, whenever the Tories or Conservatives undertook to place on the statute-book reforms which they realized were inevitable. The legislative acts of progressive Tories at times were in the nature of political "scoops." They took the position that since democracy had arrived and reforms must be passed in any event they ought to be effected under the auspices of their own party. They realized that changes were bound to take place; that the social, economic and political fabric could not remain fixed. They believed that the transition of government and society should be accomplished in an orderly manner under the guidance of a party well schooled in legislative affairs rather than in a more violent, not to say revolutionary, fashion, by a radical party. Tory Democrats would assume the initiative and bring about necessary and desired reforms without disturbing the institutions of the country. The radicals if entrusted with this task would be less inclined to hold fast to that which had been sanctioned by usage and might undertake experiments which all sections of Toryism would view with apprehension if not alarm. Tory Democracy would forestall such adventures by a wise policy of progressivism. The *Spectator* once characterized these methods as "an effort to turn the flank of radicalism." [1] The same idea was expressed by an anonymous exponent of the "new Toryism" in a pamphlet designed to convince the more cautious members of his party. "A policy of Social Reform," he wrote, "is the reasoned and hopeful alternative to Radical-Socialism." [2] Andrew D. White in the introductory chapter of *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology* has depicted the mujiks cutting channels for the sun to melt the

[1] The *Spectator*, 1893, p. 168.

[2] *National Toryism* (printed for private circulation), p. 9.

ice of the Neva in April in order to prevent a violent and sudden breaking-up process with its attendant disasters. Tory Democrats would perform a like service and apply similar efforts to the course of political events in England. They regarded Tory Democracy as the alternative to reaction and revolution.

Again, there was a perfectly legitimate opportunism in the tactics of Mr. Disraeli and Lord Randolph Churchill in their efforts to convince the workers of the mutual advantages to be obtained by uniting for political purposes with the Tories inasmuch as the Whig or Liberal manufacturing class constituted a common foe to both the land-owning aristocracy and the wage-earners.[1] The record of social legislation under Tory auspices and the resistance which such legislation frequently encountered on the part of the adherents of the Manchester School was utilized in many a speech to prove that the interests of the highest classes and the masses were identical in that they were opposed by the *bourgeois* middle-class.[2] Such an appeal undoubtedly was a factor in winning the allegiance of the wage-earners, many of whom affiliated themselves with the various Conservative Working-men's Clubs in the industrial centers of England. Thus Tory Democracy has been a vitalizing force by en-

[1] This view was developed by the Duke of Marlborough, the brother of Lord Randolph Churchill, in his article "The New Tories." He maintained that the *bourgeois* Radicals, as he called them, were not able to "point to one single Act of Parliament in which they have persistently fought for the interests of labour against capital." *Fortnightly Review,* 1889 (vol. 26), p. 736.

[2] See Disraeli's speeches on the occasion of his visit to Edinburgh in 1867. The *Scotsman,* Oct. 31, 1867, p. 6 and p. 7. The same idea was emphasized a few years later in a speech at Glasgow. *Glasgow Herald,* Nov. 21, 1873, p. 3. Campaign literature has made much use of the party's reform achievements. See for instance the National Unionist booklet, no. 1818, entitled *What Unionists Have Done for the Workers.* Hundreds of similar booklets and leaflets have been issued for campaign purposes.

listing a portion of the British labour vote in support of the Conservative party.

Opportunism, however, by no means explains Tory Democracy in its entirety. Nor is it sufficient to account for the long list of reforms which have been undertaken by the more advanced and enlightened members of the Conservative party throughout the nineteenth century. The calculating spirit of party advantage was certainly foreign to such Tories as Oastler, Sadler and the Earl of Shaftesbury. On the contrary they were animated by purely disinterested and humanitarian motives in their anxious efforts to have Parliament enact legislation in behalf of the workers in the factories and mines. Nor was Disraeli actuated solely by a desire to further the success of his party.

The fact that the author of *Sybil* and *Coningsby* in the early part of his career was unsparing in his denunciation of the social wrongs and injustices of England makes it difficult to regard his later activities in behalf of reform as having been entirely due to the spirit of opportunism. Sir John Gorst in a letter to the *Times* indignantly denied Lord Rosebery's contention that the Toryism of 1874 did not partake of the popular sympathies of *Sybil*. He declared that such an assertion was "a libel on Mr. Disraeli." [1]

Opportunism has been frequently ascribed to Lord Randolph Churchill as the sole characteristic of his brief and brilliant career. That was the favourite charge brought against him in the many attacks emanating from a section of the Tory press.[2] But his resignation from the Salisbury Cabinet because his Dartford programme of reform was not being adopted, with the result that he was driven into permanent political exile, goes far to refute such an imputation. Furthermore, "the despair and distrust" with which both

[1] The *Times*, Feb. 6, 1907, p. 7.

[2] For example see the *Spectator*, 1884, p. 1428. *Ibid.*, 1887, p. 281.

Lord Randolph Churchill and Disraeli were looked upon by the reactionary Tories should be regarded as significant of the reality and genuineness of their professions. A more recent instance of freedom from opportunism as a political motive is to be seen in the sincere appeals for a better political and social order by Lord Robert Cecil who admirably exemplifies the best traditions of Tory Democracy.

One of the motives of Tory Democrats in urging upon their party the need for remedial legislation is to be attributed to an inheritance from the past. In advocating social reforms they were acting in accordance with the benevolent feudalism which characterized their class in former times. The Tories, to a very considerable extent, have always been solicitous for the welfare of the less fortunate members of society. In the "good old days" a bond of sympathy existed between the occupants of the "hall" and the cottage. The Tory landowner, or the members of his family, felt a certain sense of responsibility for the tenants, particularly in times of distress and sickness, and frequently afforded the needed ministrations. When a new industrial order produced the factory system the descendants of these benevolent Tories continued to show their interest in the poorer classes who had migrated to the towns. Tory Democrats in demanding social and remedial legislation for the workers in factories and mines simply transferred their sense of paternal responsibility from the precincts of the "hall" to those of Parliament.

It is to be noted that this interest in the masses of the people on the part of the more generous-spirited Tories was more concerned with the social injustices than with the political inequalities which have obtained in England. Consequently the phrase "Tory Democracy" is sometimes an unfortunate designation, as Mr. Kebbel has pointed out.[1]

[1] *National Review*, 1887 (vol. 8), p. 804.

Democracy, in that it signifies a government by the people, or to speak more precisely, that form of government in which the will of the people is sovereign, did not appeal as strongly to the progressive Tories of the nineteenth century as did the idea of a government for the people. This was true of the attitude of Mr. Disraeli as well as of that of Lord Randolph Churchill, although the connection of the former with the Reform Act of 1867 and the speeches of the latter in regard to the Franchise Bill of 1884 [1] show that both these leaders were not insensible to the needs of political reform and the desirability of extending the principles of real democracy. The advocacy by Lord Robert Cecil at a later date of equal political rights for women reflected the same attitude.[2]

After all, Tory Democracy has a very spacious significance, as Lord Randolph Churchill's utterances abundantly prove. It is possible to include within its confines the various Tory legislative measures in behalf of social, economic and political reforms which look to the betterment of the people, without endangering the nation's institutions. Or again, any efforts which involved the democratizing of the party organization and the departure from antiquated party methods can be looked upon as Tory democratic.

Perhaps the best exposition of Tory Democracy which can be adduced is that contained in the Crystal Palace speech of Mr. Disraeli in 1872 when he stated that the principles of his party consisted in the maintenance of the institutions of the country and the "elevation of the condition of the people." [3] This is the basis of Sir John Gorst's definition as set forth in his communication to the *Times*.[4] It has

[1] See for example *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 288: 854-861.

[2] *Cf.* the *Times*, July 5, 1919, p. 16; *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th ser., vol. 145: 1934.

[3] The *Times*, June 25, 1872, p. 8.

[4] *Ibid.*, Feb. 6, 1907, p. 7.

served as a rallying cry of the Conservative party for more than fifty years. It formed the substance of Lord Randolph Churchill's summary of Tory Democracy in his appeal to the Manchester voters in 1885.[1] It was the policy announced by Mr. Bonar Law when he was the leader of his party,[2] and it constituted the last utterance of Mr. Baldwin as Prime Minister, just prior to his resignation in 1924.[3] It is a singularly serviceable and adaptable creed. It has been adopted by all sections of the party and is as useful at the present hour as when it was first uttered in 1872.

The same criticism which Mr. Labouchere leveled against Tory Democracy has been directed against the Crystal Palace pronouncement. To maintain the institutions of the country and inaugurate reforms and changes; to conserve the past and at the same time seek to establish a new order of society, has been regarded by some as a paradoxical formula. As a matter of fact the Tory Democrat is often torn between two desires. He clings to the old and at the same time embraces the new. His face is turned towards both the past and the future. Consequently a Tory Democrat frequently appears to be an incongruous figure. An example of this is Mr. Devlin's well-known description of Lord Robert Cecil " with one foot in the middle ages and the other in the League of Nations." Mr. Winston Churchill in addressing some of his Parliamentary colleagues once emphasized this phase of Lord Robert's contradictory inclinations. He pictured him as wandering from one extreme to the other in the House of Commons " now heading to the Labour Socialists, now scurrying back to the ultra Clericals, . . . one hand

[1] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill* (London and New York, 1889), vol. i, p. 332. See also his speech of the previous year in the same city. *Manchester Guardian,* April 17, 1884, p. 6.

[2] *Manchester Courier,* March 19, 1913, p. 8.

[3] The *Times* (weekly edition), Jan. 24, 1924, p. 84.

clasping in fraternal affection Lord Salisbury and the die-hards of the House of Lords, the other hand proffered to the Labour Party in the House of Commons." [1]

Although Tory Democrats have a regard, which in some instances amounts to reverence, for the institutions of the country, they have never defended those institutions except as they have been useful in improving society. Neither Mr. Disraeli nor Lord Randolph Churchill was opposed to change. It is well known that both of these leaders disliked the word "Conservative" because it signified a complete satisfaction with things as they are. They generally preferred to use the term "Tory" as a party label because of the greater flexibility which that designation permitted.[2]

Speaking in Manchester in 1884 Lord Randolph said that the institutions of England were to be defended on the basis of utility and not because of "any silly sentiment for the past about divine right or hereditary excellence." [3] A more cautious statement was made in a letter addressed to Mr. Herbert Vivian, who had asked Lord Randolph how far a Tory Democrat could go towards liberalism. He replied that he might go "to any extent" if by liberalism he meant progress, providing that "the maintenance of the monarchy, the House of Lords, the union between Great Britain and Ireland and the connection between Church and State" were not abandoned.[4] Sir John Gorst who was the faithful disciple of Disraeli and the political comrade of Lord Randolph Churchill has made fewer reservations in his definition of Tory Democracy. "Church and King, Lords and Commons," he asserts, "are to be maintained so far, and so

[1] The *Times*, Jan. 26, 1922, p. 12.

[2] *Fortnightly Review*, 1906 (vol. 85), p. 631.

[3] *Manchester Guardian*, Apr. 17, 1884, p. 6.

[4] *Fortnightly Review*, 1906 (vol. 86), p. 895.

far only, as they promote the welfare of the common people." [1]

Although the phrase "Tory Democracy" is peculiarly associated with the time and career of Lord Randolph Churchill it is used in the political parlance of to-day to signify a political outlook far more advanced than anything which obtained in the Conservative party during the nineteenth century. Viscount Milner's advocacy, for instance, of a greater degree of public ownership and the socialization of coal mines and other basic industries,[2] or the plea of Lord Robert Cecil for an industrial democracy in which the worker is to be raised to the status of a partner, having a voice and share not only in the profits of the concern in which he is employed, but also in its policy and management,[3] are in advance of anything dreamed of in the political philosophy of Mr. Disraeli or Lord Randolph Churchill.

Although the programme of the hour may be different the ideals and general principles which animated these exemplars of an earlier Tory Democracy are much the same as the spirit and principles actuating the advanced Tories of a later day. As Lord Bolingbroke, Pitt, Canning, Peel, Disraeli and Lord Randolph Churchill were the protagonists of an enlightened Toryism in their respective periods, so Lord Robert Cecil and other progressive Tories sustain much the same relation to the Conservative party and to the problems of their time. In fact, the historic Tory Democracy of the eighties has been accepted by the entire party of the present decade.[4] It is a question, however, whether the under-

[1] The *Times*, Feb. 6, 1907, p. 7.

[2] See *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, 5th ser., vol. 35: 683-685.

[3] Lord Robert Cecil, *The New Outlook* (London, 1919), p. 19.

[4] The adoption of Disraeli's Crystal Palace pronouncement by Mr. Bonar Law in 1913 and by Mr. Baldwin in 1924, to which reference has been made, shows how the moderate elements of the party acclaim a programme which was solely supported by the progressive Tories fifty years before.

lying principle which this movement then represented has had a similar acceptance. Lord Dunraven, who was a political associate of Lord Randolph Churchill, is authority for the statement that Tory Democracy consists in adapting the party programme and policy to the varying needs of the time.[1]

Those Tories or Conservatives, then, who have formed the left wing of their party and as advocates of a better political or social order have assumed an advanced position in their policies and in their efforts to "elevate the condition of the people" may be properly considered as Tory Democrats whether they happen to occupy the political scene in the nineteenth century or in that of the twentieth. And those Tory, Conservative or Unionist measures which have "promoted the happiness and welfare of the common people," to use the phrase of Sir John Gorst, may to some extent, at least, be regarded as the fruits of Tory Democracy.

[1] *National Review*, 1887 (vol. 9), p. 299.

CHAPTER II

The Legacy of Disraeli

"The two principles which Mr. Disraeli put as the first policy of the Conservative Party then I put as the first policy of the Unionist Party today.

"Those principles were first, to preserve, but to improve, the institutions of the country; and second, to improve the condition of the people of the country."—Mr. Bonar Law at Manchester, Mar. 18, 1913. *Manchester Courier*, Mar. 19, 1913.

Although the *Spectator* has described Disraeli as "the inventor of Democratic Toryism" [1] other leaders belonging to an earlier period had a part in sowing the seeds of democracy which Conservatives were to reap in the late decades of the nineteenth century. Some have believed Bolingbroke to be the progenitor of this movement. Disraeli, himself, seems to have shared such a belief. "Toryism," he once wrote, "will yet rise from the tomb over which Bolingbroke shed his last tears to bring back strength to the Crown, liberty to the subject and to announce that power has only one duty—to serve the social welfare of the people." [2]

During the course of a speech in Edinburgh in 1867, he declared that the progressive Tories of that day were the heirs of Bolingbroke's policy, which consisted in his efforts to unite the Crown and the masses of the people in order "to crush the oligarchs of Parliament." [3] He frequently appealed to this exemplar as a sanction for his own advanced

[1] The *Spectator*, 1887 (vol. 60), p. 69.

[2] *The Pocket Disraeli*, compiled by J. B. Lindenbaum (London, 1912), p. 13.

[3] The *Scotsman*, Oct. 31, 1867, p. 2.

views. Speaking in behalf of triennial Parliaments in 1832 he justified his position, which had caused him to be "branded as a destructive Radical," by quoting Bolingbroke who had said "there was no security for the people" without such a system.[1] In a letter to the *Times* as early as 1835, he acknowledged his indebtedness to the great Tory philosopher-statesman,[2] and Mr. O'Connor in a spiteful biography of Disraeli remarks that he cited the words of Bolingbroke in support of his views "at least hundreds of times and in a dozen different shapes."[3] Likewise, Sir Geoffrey Butler in his volume, *The Tory Tradition,* professes to see in *Coningsby, Sybil* and *Tancred,* the embodiment of Bolingbroke's political ideas. "Disraeli," he goes on to say "devoured the writings of his prototype and imbibed his point of view."[4]

Pitt also is one who helped make easier the advent of Tory Democracy. It was Disraeli who led his party to a fuller acceptance of new political principles, but "it was a party which Pitt had in the first instance educated or rather created for him."[5] He was a "democratic Minister" as Disraeli himself declared in his *Vindication of the English Constitution.* As the leader of a group known as the "New Tories" he sponsored a liberal programme including the abolishment of rotten boroughs, the granting of a more liberal parliamentary representation to the new towns and a greater degree of tolerance for Ireland. He favoured the establishment of industrial schools[6] and earnestly desired to

[1] *The Wisdom of Disraeli* or *A Great Policy for a Great Party.* Arranged by T. Comyn Platt (London, 1920), p. 27.

[2] The *Times,* Dec. 31, 1835, p. 5.

[3] T. P. O'Connor, *Life of Lord Beaconsfield* (London, 1879), p. 61.

[4] G. G. G. Butler, *The Tory Tradition* (London, 1914), p. 62.

[5] *Fortnightly Review,* 1885 (vol. 43), p. 622.

[6] *Nineteenth Century,* 1906 (vol. 59), p. 190.

reform the existing system of poor law relief. He furthermore exerted his efforts in an endeavour to remove the horrors of the slave trade, extending to his friend and parliamentary associate, Wilberforce, every encouragement and aid.[1]

Huskisson was another precursor of Tory Democracy. Like Pitt he favoured Catholic Emancipation. He was responsible for various measures which improved the condition of the workers and thus helped to associate the Tory party with the cause of social reform. His colonial policy and fiscal programme were likewise progressive and enlightened. He was well aware of the grave abuses of his time and was ready to break with the reactionism which was so generally prevalent.

Canning, too, had a share in this early prelude to Tory Democracy. His foreign policy was liberal as one of Disraeli's characters in *Endymion* remarked and he seemed "just the man appointed for an age of transition."[2] He resisted the reactionary Holy Alliance and advocated the very democratic and modern principle of self-determination of small nations. The liberal attitude displayed towards combinations of labour, during the period in which he dominated the policy of the government between 1822 and 1827, afforded further proof of an enlightened Toryism. He was also favourable to the claims of O'Connell and Catholic Emancipation.

Likewise Sir Robert Peel helped blaze the way for the party's advancement along the path of a liberalized and democratic policy. In fact, the Peelites styled themselves "Liberal-Conservatives." Peel's measures were undoubtedly akin to the spirit of Tory Democracy. This, at least, was the belief of Lord Randolph Churchill. Speaking to his constituents at Paddington in 1887 he asserted that "Sir

[1] *Fortnightly Review*, 1906 (vol. 85), pp. 490-491.

[2] Benjamin Disraeli, *Endymion* (New York, 1880), p. 5.

Robert Peel even more than Lord Beaconsfield adopted all the principles and ideas of what people call Tory Democracy." [1]

The Tory party in the popular mind had always been regarded as the party of exclusion and reaction. Peel consciously endeavoured to overcome this odium but he seems to have "gone too fast and too far for his party" and thus failed in realizing those results which Disraeli later was destined to more fully accomplish.[2] Nevertheless, he advanced democracy a step further. He "accomodated Toryism to the new regime established by the Reform Bill" and practically made a new party.[3]

Among those who should be considered in this connection are those Tory social reformers and philanthropists who were active during the first half of the nineteenth century. William Wilberforce, who annually introduced a motion in Parliament providing for the abolition of the slave-trade, is an illustrious example of the philanthropic Tory striving to better the condition of humanity.[4] The Earl of Shaftesbury whose efforts in behalf of children and the workers in mines and factories constituted one of the first attacks on individualism, Richard Oastler "the factory king" who was an extreme Tory and churchman and who bitterly hated the Whig manufacturers and Michael Sadler who has been described as an "enthusiastic Tory" and who was active in behalf of the "ten hour movement," were exemplars of a like ideal. The activities and achievements of these pioneers in social legislation played no small part in establishing a precedent and tradition for the Tory Democrats of a later day. They were essentially humanitarians and as Professor

[1] The *Times* (weekly edition), April 8, 1887, p. 761.

[2] Monypenny & Buckle, *Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*, vol. iv, p. 566.

[3] *National Review*, 1885 (vol. 6), p. 415.

[4] William Hunt, *Political History of England* (London, 1905), p. 404.

Dicey has remarked "humanitarianism was the parent of the factory movement and that movement from the first came under the guidance of the Tories." [1]

Admitting the contribution of Bolingbroke, Pitt, Canning and other liberal-minded Tories in making less difficult the advent of Tory Democracy, it is necessary to recognize that it was Disraeli who was primarily instrumental in stamping the democratic insignia on his party's escutcheon. Although Lord Randolph Churchill has been quoted in support of Sir Robert Peel's claims to consideration as an early exponent of Tory Democracy, he is also authority for many a statement calculated to show that he regarded the Jewish Prime Minister as the first protagonist of this progressive Tory cult. Speaking in the House of Commons on a proposed cloture act, Lord Randolph referred to the "great Tory Democracy which Lord Beaconsfield partly constructed." [2]

Disraeli more than the others felt the necessity of liberalizing Toryism. He perceived the rapid drift towards democracy. He realized that it had come to stay and would continue to grow. He had the political wisdom to understand clearly that his party would have to accommodate itself to the new temper of the times if it were to continue as a living political force. He maintained that the old Tory position was untenable. Unless a change should come the party was doomed to failure. When Disraeli entered Parliament the Tory party was discredited. It was identified with the forces of privilege and exclusion. A spirit of stolid contentment and inertia had seized the party. In a letter which appeared in the *Times,* in 1835, he wrote that the Tories were "in a state of ignorant stupefaction." In 1832 they were "avowedly no longer a practical party; they had no system and no object; they were passive and forlorn." [3]

[1] A. V. Dicey, *Law and Opinion in England* (London, 1914), p. 224.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates,* 3rd ser., vol. 274: 613.

[3] The *Times,* Dec. 31, 1835, p. 5.

As John Stuart Mill once observed, the Tories looked backward instead of forward for principles of government. They forgot nothing and they learned nothing. In those days, then, the name Tory stood for all that was opposed to progress.

Disraeli complained that the general desire of the Tories was "to keep things as they find them as long as they can." [1] He once stated that the Conservative Government was an "organized hypocrisy" and that his mission was to make it anew.[2] And he did make it anew. He educated and organized the party to the point of accepting a more democratic programme. When he issued his farewell address to his former constituents in 1876 he said that he had throughout his public career "aimed at two chief results." "Not insensible to the principle of progress, I have endeavored," he asserted, "to reconcile change with that respect for tradition which is one of the main elements of our social strength." [3] He succeeded in educating the Tories out of their cherished opinions if not principles, particularly in regard to the matter of suffrage. "I had to educate our party," he said in his Edinburgh speech. "In a progressive country," he continued, "change is constant; and the great question is not whether you should resist change, . . . but whether that change should be carried out in deference to the manners, the customs, the laws, the traditions of the people, or in deference to abstract principles and arbitrary and general doctrines." [4] He strove to form a new party under an old name, combining the progress of democracy with the stability of Toryism. It was not possible for the party to stand still. "We must either revert to the aristo-

[1] The *Scotsman*, Oct. 31, 1867, p. 6.

[2] The *Spectator*, 1887 (vol. 60), p. 69.

[3] *Annual Register*, 1876, p. 113.

[4] The *Scotsman*, Oct. 31, 1867, p. 6.

cratic principle," he once declared, "or we must advance to the democratic. Unless the Tories believe it is possible to restore the old principles of government or unless they have embraced a martyrdom of political insignificance, they must advance to the new." [1]

In 1858 when the Conservatives were in power, Disraeli was active in urging Parliamentary reform. He considered it impolitic and impossible for the Conservative party to assume an attitude of indifference or impotence on the question. "Had they done so," he said "they must have dwindled away in time like the Jacobites or the Non-jurors." [2] Desperate remedies were necessary and with a bold confidence he led his party along new paths. According to De Morgan it was an unpleasant task. Addressing the Earl of Beaconsfield in one of his pungent tracts, he asserted that when Disraeli cast in his lot with the Tories he discovered a state of affairs which "was nauseous" to him for "there lay the stagnant waters of Toryism covered with green spawn and filth deposited by the kings, the despots, the corrupt hearted Tories of the past," all of which, according to De Morgan, would have repelled and "deterred many." But Disraeli was determined that "an outlet should be made, the pool should be cleansed" and something good should come out of Toryism. "It was your work to educate the party," continues the address, which adds that he was completely successful, despite the fact that he had nothing in common with its historic traditions which he frankly despised.[3]

Mr. Disraeli, however, was not so contemptuous of the old order as the words of De Morgan would imply. After

[1] *National Review*, 1887 (vol. 9), p. 24.

[2] Monypenny & Buckle, *op. cit.*, vol. iv, p. 180.

[3] *De Morgan's Tracts for the Times, A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Earl of Beaconsfield*, 6th ed. (Leeds, 1880), p. 5.

all there was much of the Tory and Conservative in his political philosophy. Sir Geoffrey Butler has called him "the greatest of all Tories." [1] No British statesman ever paid more complete homage to the English Constitution than Mr. Disraeli. With him it was no mere phrase.[2] He was far from being an iconoclast. His ambition was to conserve and not to destroy. In one of his earliest speeches he said: "I am a Conservative to preserve all that is good in our constitution, a Radical to remove all that is bad. I seek to preserve property and to respect order. . . . I alike detest the despotism of an oligarchy and the pre-eminence of a mob." [3] In his famous Crystal Palace speech in 1872 he remarked that an essential part of Tory policy was to maintain the institutions of the country and the Empire.[4] He was ever solicitous for the Throne, the Church and the landed aristocracy.

Speaking in Manchester in 1872 he indignantly denied that the Conservative programme consisted in despoiling the Church and plundering the landlord of his inheritance.[5] "This country," he declared in 1867, "is a country of classes; and a country of classes it will ever remain." [6] In a letter to the *Times* in 1835 he maintained that he had never written a line or made a speech which could be construed as "hostile to the institutions of the country; on the contrary I have never," he said, "omitted an opportunity of showing, that in the maintenance of those institutions the liberties of the nation depend: that if the Crown, the Church, the House

[1] G. G. G. Butler, *The Tory Tradition*, p. 60.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 178: 1698.

[3] *Speeches of Earl of Beaconsfield*, edited by T. E. Kebbel (London, 1882), vol. i, p. 8.

[5] The *Times*, June 25, 1872, p. 8.

[5] *Manchester Guardian*, April 4, 1872, p. 8.

[6] *Wisdom of Disraeli*, p. 75.

of Lords, the corporations, the magistracy, the poor laws were successfully attacked we should fall . . . . under a grinding oligarchy." [1] He even ventured to speak a good word for feudalism, the principle of which he maintained "was the ablest, the grandest, the most magnificent and benevolent that was ever conceived by sage, or ever practised by patriot." It was a system, he explained, which enjoined those who were entrusted with property to assume responsibilities in behalf of the poor.[2]

It must be remembered, however, that it was Disraeli's purpose to temper the forms of established customs and institutions with the spirit of modernism and of popular privileges. He steadily kept in mind the desirability of blending the old with the new. He never got so far in advance of the Toryism of his day as to imperil his projects. He was no impractical idealist and he was capable of both patience and compromise. "The spirit of compromise," he once observed, "is the principal characteristic of our political system." [3] Had his methods been more drastic or his policies more extreme his effectiveness would have been destroyed and his schemes of reform would have come to nothing.

As it was he was bitterly opposed by the more orthodox members of his party. His views were anathema to the older school of Tories. They were often unwilling to follow him and treated him with disdain. Some would have driven him out of the party. Others would have been glad to see him in the ranks of the Opposition.[4] He was abused by the Tory press and many of his party regarded him as a political adventurer. Some of the extremists never spoke

[1] The *Times*, Dec. 31, 1835, p. 5.

[2] *Wisdom of Disraeli*, p. 31.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[4] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. i, p. xviii.

his name, but always referred to him as the "Jew."[1] He was called a Radical in disguise or a fanatical dreamer. Lord Rosebery has remarked that prior to 1874 he was regarded with distrust and despair by his followers.[2] At times they were whispering to each other: "We shall do no good while he leads us."[3] Prominent among the Tories who shared this hostility was Lord Salisbury to whom Mr. Disraeli represented the worst type of opportunism. As Lord Cranborne, in 1867, he gave evidence of his distrust and dislike by resigning from the Ministry as a protest against the proposed Reform Bill of that year.[4] After 1867 the antagonism grew. As late as 1870 Mr. Froude wrote a letter in which he remarked that he had been among the "Tory Magnates" who still regarded "the mystery man" with distrust and were determined never to be led by him again.[5]

The dislike and enmity displayed by the more cautious and unyielding Tories, however, was matched by the loyalty and support of the younger adherents of the party, who gladly followed his leadership.[6] The reasons for Disraeli's ascendancy over the younger Tories can be readily understood. Their more ardent zeal had been chilled and restrained. There was nothing to appeal to their generous and exuberant inclinations. They were tied down and crippled by an autocratic party machine and an outworn political creed. To secure political preferment they were on no account to think for themselves. Blind and servile submis-

[1] Churchill, *op. cit.*, p. xix.

[2] Lord Rosebery, *Miscellanies, Literary and Historical* (London, 1921), vol. i, pp. 342-343.

[3] Keith Feiling, *Toryism* (London, 1910), p. ix.

[4] *Annual Register*, 1867, p. 88.

[5] H. W. Lucy, *Memories of Eight Parliaments* (London, 1908), p. 40.

[6] *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1854 (vol. 75), p. 261.

sion to the Prime Minister's will was the sole requirement for favourable consideration and future advancement. They were treated as children, quite incapable of forming an opinion of their own. Failure to obey implicitly the party whip was fatal. Their political energies were not to be spent on social questions. To serve on some innocuous committee was deemed more fitting and would be more conducive to developing a temperament of political conformity.

It was against such a state of affairs that a considerable portion of the enlightened Tories rebelled. They refused to submit further to reactionary party tyranny. Consequently, when Disraeli presented himself as the leader of a new Toryism, circumstances had created a following which was ready to do his bidding. This group became known as "Young England" and was active during the first years of the Peel Government. A statement setting forth its programme appears in Mr. Disraeli's preface to the collected edition of his novels. In this summary he says:

> They trusted much to a popular sentiment which rested on an heroic tradition and was supported by the high spirit of a free aristocracy. Their economic principles were not unsound but they looked upon the health and knowledge of the multitude as not the least precious part of the nation.

As Lord Randolph Churchill and the Fourth Party opposed the reactionary Conservatism in the eighties, so "Young England" forty years earlier displayed the same restive spirit of discontent and protest. Also like the Fourth Party this earlier manifestation of Tory Democracy was limited to a few members. Among its adherents were Lord John Manners, the Duke of Rutland, Lord Winchelsea, Alexander Baillie and a few other young aristocrats of high birth and liberal impulses. Mr. George Smythe, one of the leaders, has become familiar to us as the hero in

Coningsby. Lord John Manners likewise has a place in the same novel and is to be identified with the character of Lord Henry Sidney, who is described as having a "strong sympathy with the peasantry" of England. While a schoolboy at Eton he is depicted as busying himself with schemes for their social betterment. The child was father of the man and on "the threshold of his career, he devoted his time and thought, labour and life, to one vast and noble purpose, the elevation of the great body of the people."[1] He was the poet of the movement and in his volume, *England's Trust,* he lamented the passing of a benevolent feudalism which "bound the peers and gentry to their fellow men." In verse of rather doubtful merit he pictured the unhappy conditions which had succeeded the older order which obtained in the days of "Merrie England."

> "Now in their places behold the modern slave,
> Doomed, from the very cradle to the grave
> To tread his lonely path of care and toil;
> Bound in sad truth and bowed down to the soil,
> He dies and leaves his sons their heritage,
> Work for their prime, the workhouse for their age."

These verses expressed a lively concern for the welfare of the lowlier classes. To redress their wrongs was an imperative and immediate duty. If the interests of England's disinherited are not cared for it will happen that—

> ". . . The greatest class of all shall know its rights
> And the poor trampled people rise at last."[2]

The members of "Young England" would "bring back joy to the sombre and monotonous lives of the labouring poor" and do all possible to "redeem them from the misery

[1] Benjamin Disraeli, *Coningsby*, bk. ix, ch. i.

[2] Lord John Manners, *England's Trust and Other Poems* (London, 1841), p. 16.

and serfdom into which they had fallen." Like Egremont in *Sybil* they believed the poor could best be protected and their welfare assured by the aristocracy. Unlike Brougham and the doctrinaires, they did not aim to make "philosophers of artisans and scholars out of mechanics." Their ambition was to draw both artisans and mechanics and still more the agricultural labourers into kindly intercourse with the classes above them. This was to be accomplished partly through sports and games and social intercourse. It had its partial realization forty years later in the activities of the Primrose League.

Reference has already been made to the novels of Disraeli. They were by no means confined to an exposition of the "Young England" movement. *Contarini Fleming* as well as other works were used as vehicles to convey Mr. Disraeli's opinions and convictions on all sorts of political and social problems. They served to popularize, strengthen and prepare the way for a more advanced Toryism. *Coningsby*, *Sybil* and *Tancred* constituted a political manifesto which contained the seeds of a later Tory Democracy. They attempted to infuse a new spirit into the Tory party and inspire it with a humanitarian impulse. The social note was frequently conspicuous. They were novels with a purpose. They emphasized the need of remedial legislation to improve the condition of the people.

In none of his novels did Disraeli set forth the economic ills of England and the wretchedness of the masses more powerfully than in *Sybil*. The degradation of the people and the gulf which yawned between the rich and the poor is the constant theme of Sybil Gerard. In a vein of incisive and bitter irony the writer describes the two classes or nations which exist side by side in England, each as ignorant of the other's mode of life as if they had been inhabitants of different planets. The harsh treatment by the

masters who "habitually inflict upon their subjects punishments more grievous than the slave populations" of the colonies is pictured in the blackest colors.[1] How to bridge the gulf between the rich and the poor is a problem which commanded the author's serious attention. Grievances were to be redressed and a new order was to be brought about, not by "levelling the few but by elevating the many," to use the words of Egremont.[2] A happier condition was to be realized by uniting the masses to the Tory party and thus making it the popular party of the country. In the last chapter the hope is expressed that England once more may "possess a free monarchy and a privileged and prosperous people." In such an undertaking the youth of the land were to have a potent share. "To be young and to be indifferent" to the needs of the hour was impossible. The youth of the nation were "the trustees of posterity" and it was their task to provide for the future welfare of England by remedying the wrongs of "suffering millions."[3]

The manufacturing and middle-classes who belonged to the Whig party were represented as the oppressors of the workers. Hence, the author is not sparing in his denunciation of the evils growing out of the industrial system of the country, as a result of class selfishness. Professor Dicey has pointed out that Disraeli knew full well that this novel which attacked the abuses of the factory-system was calculated to serve as political propaganda by showing how "the Tories were the true friends of the working-classes."[4]

How much practical good resulted from these writings it is of course difficult to determine. Some exaggerated claims have been made in their behalf. One admirer of

[1] *Cf. Sybil*, bk. i, ch. v.

[2] *Ibid.*, bk. ii, ch. xiv.

[3] *Ibid.*, bk. vi, ch. xiii.

[4] A. V. Dicey, *Law and Opinion in England*, p. 233.

Disraeli, for instance, has observed that with the publication of *Sybil* in 1845 there began a long series of factory and workshop acts all of which received the support of Toryism.[1]

Coningsby, like *Sybil,* is addressed to the young aristocrats of England. Like *Sybil* it declares war against age and proclaims that England is to be saved by its youth. A spirit of protest and revolt against the dead weight of Conservatism pervades its pages. The older and more cautious type of leadership is assailed. Conservatism is described as an effort to carry on affairs by "a negative system" which relies on the "influence of property, reputable private conduct and what are called good connections." He avers that it "offers no reason for the present and makes no preparation for the future."[2] Later, the author proceeds to say: "The Tory party . . . . was held to be literally defunct, except by a few old battered cronies of office, crouched round the embers of faction which they were fanning, and muttering reaction in mystic whispers."[3]

The same note of protest and caustic analysis is to be found in *Contarini Fleming.* The writer complains because of too much credence in the authority of the dead past. "We believe what our fathers credited." This habit, the novelist asserts, has destroyed the power of thought and explains why people "fly with rapture and false knowledge, to tradition, to prejudice, to custom—delusive tradition, destructive prejudice, degenerating custom."[4]

There is another and more constructive message which the fiction of Disraeli was designed to convey. He would show how a new and vitalized Toryism has the possibility of

[1] *Fortnightly Review,* 1918 (vol. 109), p. 76.

[2] *Coningsby,* bk. ii, ch. v.

[3] *Ibid.,* bk. iv, ch. iv.

[4] *Contarini Fleming,* bk. i, ch. i.

growth, progress and reform. "To vindicate the just claims of the Tory party to be the popular political confederation of the country," was the avowed object of his writings. In *Coningsby,* as well as in *Sybil,* the confident prophecy is made that Toryism will arise from its grave and secure for the masses of the people their just share of the good things in life.

Other methods than those of fiction were used to spread these same opinions. In 1853 he established a weekly journal "to propagate his own Tory Democratic ideas," to use Mr. Monypenny's phrase.[1] In a letter to a political friend Mr. Disraeli wrote that the paper "though Tory" was to be "of a very progressive and enlightened design."[2] One of his earliest writings was in the form of a pamphlet entitled *Who Is He,* which not only roundly abused the Whigs but discussed democratic principles and advocated a fusion of Tories and Radicals. A few years later in his *Vindication of the English Constitution,* he set forth a policy, which he frequently advocated, whereby the Crown, the nobility and the masses of the people should be united for political purposes because their identity of interest was determined by a common enemy.

Disraeli's speeches likewise reflect the spirit of Tory Democracy. The social note is sounded in no uncertain way. "I hope," he once said,

> ever to be found on the side of the people. . . . It is unnecessary for me to state that I shall support all those measures the object of which is to elevate the moral and social condition of the working-classes by lessening their hours of toil, by improving their means of health and by cultivating their intelligence.

[1] Monypenny and Buckle, *op. cit.,* vol. iii, p. 491.

[2] *Ibid.*

The "principal wealth" of the nation, he declared, consisted in "the character" and well-being of the people.[1] How much the wealth of the country depended upon the working-classes—"on their ample and remunerative employment"—and the desirability of improving their condition, was the subject of his comment in the House of Commons in 1860.[2] To neglect the workers was a policy of dangerous possibilities. "The palace is not safe when the cottage is not happy," he once observed.[3] His sympathy with the unfortunate was seen in his attacks on the poor laws as they existed in 1838-1839. He protested against a system which sent to the workhouse a man and his family who by accident or sickness happened to be thrown, even for a single day, upon the parish.

When Disraeli, the novelist and free lance, succeeded to place and power he did not abandon those principles which he had espoused during his earlier career. This was a source of considerable uneasiness in certain quarters. The *Scotsman* on the occasion of his Edinburgh visit in October, 1867, remarked in an editorial that his ideas were "amusing enough when first expounded in the pages of a political novel but became perilous stuff now that they are deliberately expounded by a responsible Minister of the Crown."[4]

Throughout his career in Parliament he consistently supported all measures of social reform. Speaking at Edinburgh to a deputation of workers in 1867 he said that during the thirty years prior to that date, thirty-two acts which favoured the working-classes had been passed by Parliament. These laws, he went on to say, affected "their wages, their education, their hours of toil . . . . the object of which

[1] *Wisdom of Disraeli*, p. 40.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 156: 1803-1804.

[3] Monypenny and Buckle, *op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 368.

[4] The *Scotsman*, Oct. 31, 1867, p. 2.

was to alleviate their condition and to soften the asperities" of the workers' lot. He reminded his hearers that he was their guest and was not seeking votes, but he did want to take occasion to let them know that he had always believed in social legislation and hence had heartily supported every one of the measures to which he had referred. He added that they had likewise received the support of his party. Nor did he neglect the opportunity to remind the Edinburgh workers that these acts had often been vigorously and bitterly opposed by the Whigs. He referred to the aid which Lord John Manners had given twenty-five years before. He went on to say they had both been ardent advocates of the State improving the great mass of the population. "I have always," he continued, "looked upon the interests of the labouring classes as essentially the most Conservative interests of the country. The rights of labour have been to me as sacred as the rights of property." He made special mention of the measure which extended the provisions of the Factory Act of 1866 to all the trades of the United Kingdom. Another Act regulating the hours of labour for women and children which was also passed in 1867, as well as legislation providing for compulsory education received passing notice. He then went on to speak of Lord Elcho's Bill to change the law with respect to contracts between master and servant. In his opinion no law was ever passed which "more sensibly" improved "the condition of the great body of the people." The old law which had made a breach of contract on the part of the worker a criminal offense and which exempted the master from punishment for a like behaviour was a gross injustice. He was happy to know that such a condition no longer obtained. He also declared that he was not opposed to workers' organizations for the purpose of bettering their conditions. If laws prevented such combinations he would be glad to have Parlia-

ment change them.[1] The Employers' and Workmen's Act which the Disraeli Government passed in 1875 as well as the Conspiracy Act of the same year which aided trade unionism and secured the right to strike proved the sincerity of these statements.

Several years after his Edinburgh visit Mr. Disraeli had a similar experience in Glasgow. On that occasion a deputation from the Short Hours Association tendered him an address expressing "the most grateful thanks of the factory workers for the services . . . . rendered in promoting successful factory legislation from the results of which so many blessings, socially, mentally and physically" had been conferred upon the women and children employed in that branch of their national industry. The address continued as follows:

> We are not unmindful of the hearty co-operation and valuable aid you gave our cause in early life nor of the active assistance you have always rendered in more mature years. It is to gentlemen like yourself who espoused our cause when it was unpopular to do so that the working people are most indebted and to whom their gratitude is more especially due.

Appreciation was further expressed for his "efforts in the cause of reducing the hours of labour in the factories" and requesting his continued support for a further shortening of the working day.

In reply Mr. Disraeli recalled his interest in the Ten Hours' Bill which he declared was "one of the most satisfactory incidents of" his life. This Act, he said, had for its purpose the elevation of the working-classes which was conditioned on shorter hours and higher wages. He then went on to say that if the lot of the worker was to be a happier one he must have sufficient leisure to cultivate his intelli-

[1] The *Scotsman*, Oct. 31, 1867, p. 6.

gence.[1] The *Glasgow Herald* in its editorial comment a few days after the interview between Disraeli and the workers suggested that the making of political capital had not been entirely absent in these proceedings. Reference was made to an operative who had suggested the advantages which the Conservatives might derive from their support of the Nine Hours' Bill. The great leader was depicted as "looking like Ulysses and shaking his brow at the suggestion." In ironical vein the writer observed that the idea of party advantage to be derived from such action never entered his mind. He knew nothing of such miserable motives. His sole considerations were the advantages to the workingmen themselves and the benefits that would be conferred upon the country.[2]

At no period during his long career did Disraeli express his interest in the masses of the people more than in 1872. Two important pronouncements were made at that time. The first was at Manchester in April when he addressed himself to a consideration of the agricultural and urban workers. This speech fixed for some time the policy of the Tory party. The speaker contended that the constitution was an effective instrument for ensuring the progressive welfare of the masses. He spoke of their needs and aspirations and reviewed the efforts which had been made to better their conditions in recent years. He maintained that "the first consideration of a Minister should be the people's health. . . . Pure air, pure water, the inspection of unhealthy habitations, the adulteration of food, these and many kindred matters may be legitimately dealt with by the legislature," he said. He then made use of a well-known passage from the *Vulgate* which for years served as a text for Tory exhortations.

[1] *Glasgow Herald,* Nov. 21, 1873, p. 3.

[2] *Ibid.*, Nov. 22, 1873, p. 4.

This rallying cry consisted in the expression "*Sanitas sanitatum, omnia sanitas.*" [1]

A speech delivered at Crystal Palace in June was an elaboration of his Manchester message. The three objects of the Tory party, he declared, were to maintain the institutions of the country, to preserve the Empire and "to elevate the condition of the people." The latter purpose, he said, was not inferior to the others. Such a programme comprised the essence of Toryism and democracy. The old was to be retained but there was to be also adequate recognition of the social needs of the day. Addressing himself to the latter problem he asserted that the elevation of the people was not possible unless their hours of labour were reduced and their toil humanized. He combated the contention of the liberals that the reduction of the hours of labour would diminish the returns of invested capital, thus anticipating an economic fact which was fully established fifty years later. Nor would it lead, he maintained, to a diminution of wages and the "impoverishment of the Kingdom."

He referred to that part of the Manchester speech which had to do with the health of the people. He repeated that this was a most important consideration for a statesman. It involved the "regulation of industry" the inspection of labour, pure food and all measures calculated to divert the masses "from habits of excess and brutality." Unfit housing conditions produced not only evil physical consequences but bad moral conditions as well. He called attention to the ridicule which these remarks had provoked in the Liberal press. A leading member of the Liberal party, he added, denounced his views "as the policy of sewage." "Well," he went on to say:

it may be the "policy of sewage" to a Liberal member of Parliament. But to one of the labouring multitude of England,

[1] *Speeches of Earl of Beaconsfield*, vol. ii, p. 511.

who has found fever always one of the inmates of his household—who has, year after year, seen stricken down the children of his loins, on whose sympathy and material support he has looked with hope and confidence, it is not a "policy of sewage" but a question of life and death. And I can tell you this, gentlemen, from personal conversation with some of the most intelligent of the labouring class . . . that the policy of the Tory party—the hereditary, the traditional policy of the Tory party, that would improve the condition of the people—is more appreciated by the people than the ineffable mysteries and all the pains and penalties of the Ballot Bill.

Passing to a consideration of the fortunes of the Tory party, he remarked that its weakness in the past was due to apathy and indifference and its departure from the principles of Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville. He then elaborated a favourite theory of his. The Tory party, he insisted, must become a popular party or a national party. It was nothing if it did not represent the whole nation. "It is not a confederacy of nobles," he continued, "It is not a democratic multitude. It is a party formed from all the numerous classes in the realm . . . . whose different conditions and different aims give vigour and variety to our national life." [1]

Another theme to which he reverted on this occasion was the danger which he always professed to see in middle-class domination. Hence he was opposed to a *bourgeois* government in any form, because it derived its strength by solely appealing "to the selfish instincts of capitalists." This view he constantly reiterated throughout his career. Toryism, he maintained, in one of his volumes, was more democratic than Whiggism. "It appeals," he wrote, "with a keener sympathy to the passions of the millions; it studies their interests with a more comprehensive solicitude." [2] But the Whigs, he once declared in the House of Commons, were

[1] *Beaconsfield's Speeches*, vol. ii, pp. 531-533.

[2] B. Disraeli, *Whigs and Whiggism*, p. 340.

always ready to increase their own power at the expense not only of the aristocracy but of the workers as well. He contended that the rights of labour received very little consideration at their hands. "The middle-class," he said, "emancipated the negroes; but they never proposed a Ten Hours' Bill." [1] While they sought colonial reform which cost them nothing and parliamentary reform which served their own class interests "they entirely neglected the industrial classes." Likewise they undertook "commercial reform . . . under the specious name of free trade" which he declared helped the manufacturers more than the wage-earners.[2] Since the Whig middle-classes, then, were bent exclusively on their own interests, it was needful that patrician and plebeian should present a united opposition to their pretensions.

To oppose the "oligarchic" principles of the Whigs was his fixed purpose. Hence he constantly attacked the Reform Bill of 1832 which, he said, was designed to retain and confirm in power the Whig party. In a letter which appeared in the *Times* in 1835 he mentioned the fact that he was not in England when Lord Grey's bill was enacted. On his return, he remarked that he "found the nation in terror of a rampant democracy. As for himself he "saw only an impending oligarchy." The Tories, he went on to say, "fancied themselves on the eve of a reign of terror when they were about to sink under the sovereignty of a Council of Ten." [3] He declared that the reform of 1832 was unjust not only because it gave the middle-class a monopoly of power but because it excluded the working-classes from that share in the franchise which belonged to them.[4] Speaking

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 99: 959-960.

[2] *Pocket Disraeli*, p. 57.

[3] The *Times*, Dec. 31, 1835, p. 5.

[4] *Annual Register*, 1872, p. 20.

in the House of Commons in 1850 he is reported as saying: "I regret that when the privileges of the working-classes were abrogated no equivalent was devised. I regret that in the Reform Act the rights of the working-classes were not more respected." The Liberals, he contended, had revealed themselves as the "active opponents of this class of voters." [1] A few years earlier while criticising a bill which Mr. Locke King had introduced for the purpose of extending the franchise, he declared, that the greatest mistake in the Reform Act of 1832 consisted in making property the sole qualification of political rights. The same objection was to be urged against the measure which was then under consideration, since property alone was its basis.[2] In his Edinburgh speech he again denounced this Act because it had ignored the rights of the working-classes. If "the settlement of 1832 was to be altered he was determined in so far as he had power . . . . it should be so altered as to give to the working-classes that full and fair share of the suffrage" to which he always thought they were entitled.[3] Because they had been denied this privilege their resentment was all the more bitter when short hours, high wages, cheap bread, annual Parliaments and other hoped-for changes were not forthcoming.[4]

Somewhat akin to these expressions was his attitude towards the Chartist movement, with which to a certain extent he was in sympathy. Although he disclaimed any great confidence in the remedies proposed he spoke of the Chartists themselves in a generous and appreciative manner. In contrast to the contempt displayed by Lord John Russell he was at least open-minded and considerate. He held that

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 112: 1176.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 99: 952.

[3] The *Scotsman*, Oct. 31, 1867, p. 6.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 99: 253.

the complaints brought forward were not groundless; that recent legislation had not been favourable to them and their class and that sooner or later, whether the Whigs desired it or not, the time was coming when the working-classes would demand and obtain a larger share in the management of public affairs. He added that "the Chartists complained only of the Government of the middle-classes. They made no attack on the aristocracy . . . . but upon the newly enfranchised constituency." [1] On an earlier occasion he made a speech of considerable length in the House of Commons to show that the Whigs were responsible for the conditions which produced Chartism and suggested the necessity of an alliance between the Tories and the Chartists.[2] A specific instance of his friendliness to the Chartists consisted in his being one of five who voted to pardon Frost, a prominent leader of the movement.

Of course, the outstanding act of democratic Toryism which attaches to the career of Mr. Disraeli is the Reform Bill of 1867. Various motives have been ascribed for the part he played in thus extending the franchise. "To dish the Whigs" has been one of the generally accepted explanations.[3] As franchise reform was bound to come in any event Disraeli was quite determined that the Tories and not the Liberals should have the credit accruing therefrom. Besides he had always maintained that "reform was not a Whig monopoly." He was glad of an opportunity to disprove the Liberals' contention that the Tories were opposed to every sort of Parliamentary reform.[4]

Expediency and a political acumen which saw the ad-

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 99: 250.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 49: 252.

[3] F. J. C. Hearnshaw, *Democracy at the Crossways* (London, 1918), p. 158.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 186: 642-643.

vantage of making a virtue of necessity, according to Mr. Labouchere, help explain the course pursued by the great Conservative leader. As a practical politician Mr. Disraeli realized that only a party ready and willing to enlarge the electorate had any chance of power in the decades to come. His biographers have explained that as soon as he perceived the determined and general demand for reform throughout the country "he acted with promptitude and decision" to carry out the public wish.[1] He had his ear to the ground. "Hooting the Carlton" and cheering before Mr. Gladstone's residence and the Reform Club were not without their effect. This was the opinion of John Bright who believed that the big meetings and agitation for electoral reform throughout the country constituted a big factor in determining the position which Mr. Disraeli took.[2]

In his Edinburgh speech, Disraeli himself set forth the motives which actuated his course. He asserted that electoral reform was in harmony with the tradition of his party, it having been first inaugurated by "the great Tory leaders of the beginning of the Eighteenth Century." But "the Tories were defeated by a powerful Whig oligarchy and their opinions were for many years in abeyance." Fortunately, however, the Whigs in turn were discredited and there followed a regime "in favour of trust in the Sovereign power and the peoples' independence." Mr. Pitt came forward "to advocate Parliamentary Reform. It was not true," he declared, "that the Tories had poached on ground that was not their own." As further proof of his contention he went on to say:

[1] Monypenny and Buckle, *op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 488.

[2] William Robertson, *Life and Times of John Bright* (London, 1912), vol. ii, p. 48. On the Reform Bill of 1867 and Disraeli's part in it see J. H. Park, *The Reform Act of 1867* (New York, 1920).

when Lord John Russell had announced that he would introduce a Reform Bill there was a meeting of Tory leaders at which it was decided never to oppose a new Reform Bill but always to assist its introduction and to seek to mould it into the most advantageous form for the country. That resolution taken nearly twenty years ago had been religiously adhered to. [He had] never omitted an opportunity of claiming the right of the Tory party to deal with Reforms. . . . Since they had the right it was only the duty of the Tory party in 1867 to deal with Reform.

Still further to substantiate his claims he pointed out that Lord Derby in 1859 had made an effort to effect an extension of the franchise.[1]

Mr. Disraeli's pronouncement at Edinburgh, naturally enough, aroused much ironical and facetious comment among the skeptically minded. The *Scotsman,* commenting on this speech observed in caustic vein that the Reform Act of 1867 was "a reactionary measure designed to help the successors of Stafford, Bolingbroke and Pitt."[2] In another article the same paper called attention to the fact that some of the friends of Conservatism were by no means pleased with the Bill,[3] an observation which was quite true. Nothing was more inevitable than the hostility of the unbending Tories to the measure. It is one of the many instances of opposition which democratic Toryism always encountered within the party ranks. Among those who assailed the Reform was Lord Cranborne (later Marquis of Salisbury) whose speech against the Act has been described as "one of the most biting" ever delivered in the House of Commons.[4]

[1] *Speeches of Earl of Beaconsfield,* vol. ii, p. 472.

[2] The *Scotsman,* Oct. 31, 1867, p. 2.

[3] *Ibid.,* Oct. 30, 1867, p. 2.

[4] A. Patchett Martin, *Life of Lord Sherbrooke* (London, 1893), vol. ii, p. 320.

To be sure, there is much to be said in justification of Lord Cranborne's position. He believed that Disraeli had not kept faith with those who had put the Conservatives in power. Because Lord Cranborne considered himself bound by the compunctions of political morality and the commitments of himself and his party, which he insisted were violated by Mr. Disraeli's proposals, he denounced the measure, describing it as "a political betrayal" without parallel in the annals of England. He added that it struck "at the root of all that mutual confidence which is the very soul of party government." He declared that the Bill not only violated the tenets of the Conservative party, but, furthermore was "based upon the principles of Bright and dictated by Gladstone." [1]

Mr. Robert Lowe (later Viscount Sherbrooke) was one of those who bitterly arraigned the measure. He prophesied that the day would come, when England, through the instrumentality of the Reform Act, would be delivered over to the mob. "I am very down-hearted," he wrote to his brother, "about the future of the country." [2] On another occasion he observed that it was now imperative for "our future masters to learn their letters." [3] The Bill, he said, "merits alike the contempt of all honest men and the execration of posterity." [4]

Lord Carnarvon likewise protested against the Act which he said was tantamount to "the abandonment of all principle and a total confusion and demoralization of all party." He insisted that the Tories had always been opposed to

[1] Lady John Russell, *A Memoir* (London, 1910), p. 212. For an account justifying Lord Cranborne's attitude, see Lady Gwendolen Cecil, *Life of Robert Marquis of Salisbury* (London, 1921), vol. i, pp. 222-298.

[2] A. Patchett Martin, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 325.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 323.

[4] John Morley, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 235.

"property and education" being "swamped by mere numbers." Nor did he believe, as had been asserted, that "household suffrage has always been the esoteric faith of Conservative cabinets."[1] Even the Earl of Shaftesbury was not entirely in sympathy with the Bill, a fact which showed that while he was a great humanitarian he was not deeply imbued with the spirit of political democracy. While he admitted that the reform was bound to come sometime, he believed that it ought to be a more gradual process and should be bestowed as a reward for honesty and industry.[2]

Not only the extreme Tories but the press and *reviews* also attacked the measure. Cynical and unworthy motives were ascribed to Disraeli's reforming zeal. The *North British Review* in an article of some twenty thousand words entitled "The Achievements and the Moral of 1867" lamented the dire calamities which were sure to result from this "leap in the dark." The whole business was discreditable. It revealed "a collapse of principle and a disintegration of party far beyond anything" witnessed in that age. Old landmarks had been "removed and new principles and modes of action" avowed. Statesmen and parties had "curiously changed places and . . . . views." Confidence in the "wisdom and integrity of public men" had "received a shock" from which it would require years to recover. The predominant feeling "on the minds of all thinking men" was one "of mingled surprise, shame, mortification and vague uneasiness, sometimes rising almost to dismay." They no longer knew "where to look for guidance or whence to expect resistance and stability." Only the Radicals could "rejoice at the result." Both Liberals and Conservatives must deplore the situation. It was of much more

[1] *North British Review*, 1867, p. 111.

[2] *Annual Register*, 1867, p. 96.

serious import than the conflicts of 1832 and 1846. A national crisis had been produced. The Conservative leaders had "displayed a disingenuousness and their followers a mingled short-sightedness and cynical laxity of principle or feebleness of character for which no decent explanation or creditable excuse can be alleged." Lord Cranborne, Lord Carnarvon, General Peel and Mr. Lowe were commended for not sharing "the sin of" Mr. Disraeli who was credited with the cynical design of merely seeking votes. "He believes," the article went on to say, "that even the ignorance and incapacity of the lowest class of the new electors is of a sort that will be more malleable by their betters than by the demagogue." The Bill was enacted with the belief that the new voters could be confidently "expected to adopt the opinions of those above them." [1]

Even John Bright thought Disraeli carried reform too far. Notwithstanding the *dictum* of Lord Cranborne the measure in its final form was opposed not only by Mr. Bright but by Gladstone as Lord Randolph Churchill reminded his audience in Leeds while speaking on the Franchise Bill of 1884.[2] Carlyle also had a fling at the act describing it as "the suicide of the English Nation." [3] But Mr. Disraeli answered these critics by declaring: "I think England is safe in the race of men who inhabit her." [4]

To what extent then did Mr. Disraeli really believe in democracy? Did he favour government by the people or was he merely an opportunist hoping to use the workers for party purposes? Mr. Arthur A. Baumann in the *Fortnightly Review* writes as follows: "A democrat in the sense of one who advocates the rule of numbers, untested by

[1] *North British Review*, Sept., 1867, pp. 105-132.

[2] *Pall Mall Gazette*, Oct. 4, 1884, p. 10.

[3] A. Patchett Martin, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 304.

[4] H. Paul, *op. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 89.

fitness . . . . Lord Beaconsfield was not." [1] Mr. T. P. O'Connor in his unfriendly biography which was designed to prove that Mr. Disraeli was nothing more than an opportunist, maintains that "the great principle and the great secret of Lord Beaconsfield has been to play on the meaner passions of men." He then quotes *Vivian Grey* as follows: "We must mix with the herd; we must enter into their feelings; we must humour their weaknesses; we must sympathise with the sorrows that we do not feel, and share the merriment of fools." Lord Beaconsfield, comments Mr. O'Connor, "has fully acted up to these ideas." [2] An earlier contemporaneous observer of political affairs has written that Disraeli was encouraged to extend "the power of the Democracy" because he foresaw that the people would never make complete use of it." In any event they could be easily controlled. "He divined that the glamour which wealth and riches have for the majority of voters would make it easy to put a hook in the nose of Leviathan and that the monster might be ultimately taken in tow by the Conservative party." [3]

In catering to the people and in pursuing a policy of opportunism, Mr. Disraeli was no better and no worse than other statesmen in either of the political camps. As has already been pointed out, he perceived clearly enough that unless his party enlarged the urban franchise there was little likelihood of its succeeding to power. But it must be added that, like Lord Shelburne, he had no fear of the people. This does not mean that Mr. Disraeli believed in political democracy as understood in the twentieth century or as Lincoln expressed it at Gettysburg. It is more correct

[1] *Fortnightly Review*, 1918 (vol. 109), p. 79.

[2] T. P. O'Connor, *Life of Lord Beaconsfield*, pp. 69-70.

[3] Lady John Russell, *A Memoir* (London, 1910), p. 210.

to say that he believed in a popular Toryism rather than a democratic Toryism. "The strength of the House of Commons," he once remarked, "should rest on a broad popular basis."[1] "Lord Beaconsfield has made Tory principles popular principles," declared Mr. Bourke, a prominent member of the Conservative Government in 1879.[2] Disraeli asserted in 1867 that he would strenuously contend that the electoral franchise must be considered a popular franchise and not a democratic right.[3] "I doubt very much," he remarked in the House of Commons, "whether a democracy is a Government that would suit this country." He declared that he preferred a "Government by the best men of all classes."[4] When Mr. Gladstone introduced his franchise proposals in 1866 they were opposed by the Conservative leader on the ground that English institutions would be Americanized thereby.[5] Speaking on his own Reform Bill in the House of Commons he declared: "We do not live and I trust it will never be the fate of this country to live under a democracy. The propositions which I am going to make to-night certainly have no tendency in that direction." If the Bill was considered a liberal measure of popular privileges then it was proper to regard it as "prudent, wise and essentially constitutional. If, on the other hand," he continued, "it be looked upon as a measure having for its object to confer democratic rights . . . . much that it may contain may be viewed in the light of being indefensible and unjust."[6] Although the motive which prompted these ut-

[1] *Beaconsfield's Speeches*, vol. i, p. 547.

[2] Pamphlet printed by the Leeds Conservative Association containing Mr. Bourke's speech (Leeds, n. d.), p. 31.

[3] *Annual Register*, 1867, p. 20.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 178: 1702.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. 183: 103.

[6] *Ibid.*, vol. 186: 7.

terances was to some extent that of disarming the ultra-Tory critics in his own party, the fact still remains that he did not accept the principle of "government by the people." He did, however, believe in the fullest measure of "government for the people."

To what extent did Disraeli believe in the Conservative working-men? He seems to have believed that if the legitimate aspirations of the workers were respected and satisfied they would support the Conservative party and the things for which it stood. Speaking of the Reform Bill of 1867 he said: "That act was founded on a confidence that the great body of the people of this country were 'Conservative.'" He then explained that this was especially true of "the working-classes of England."[1] In the course of a speech to a deputation of Conservative Associations in England and Wales he remarked that he had favoured Workingmen's Associations from the beginning. He said that he "always had confidence in their future. . . . Of all men . . . . I think Workingmen should be most conservative." He then added: "we must look to all classes but to" the workers "particularly to maintain the Empire. . . ."[2] He always believed that the masses of the people were at heart Tory and could be safely trusted.[3] Consequently the workers of England were referred to as Disraeli's "political children."[4] He needed their support. He had met with discouraging obstacles and opposition in appealing to the aristocracy for aid in his programme of social betterment. He despised the domination of the middle-classes. It only remained for him boldly to trust the masses.

He was predisposed in favour of giving the workers the

[1] *Beaconsfield's Speeches*, vol. ii, p. 527.

[2] The *Times*, Aug. 7, 1878, p. 11.

[3] F. E. Smith, *Unionist Policy*, p. 42.

[4] The *Scotsman*, Oct. 31, 1867, p. 6.

franchise because he was confident that the Crown would be strengthened thereby. He believed that the Throne was nearer to the people than was the House of Commons. The latter strove to promote class interests. "The only power that has no class sympathy is the Sovereign," he once wrote.[1] He contended that the monarchy of England was rooted "in the hearts of the people" and if it was necessary to "find a new force to maintain the ancient throne" he hoped to find that power "in the invigorating energies of an . . . . enfranchised people."[2] "I say with confidence," he asserted in one of his speeches, "that the great body of the working-class of England . . . . are English to the core. They are for maintaining," he added, "the greatness of the Kingdom and the Empire, and they are proud of being subjects of our Sovereign and members of such an Empire."[3] As early as 1850 he addressed the Whigs in the House of Commons telling them that they did not dare contemplate universal male suffrage, because if that should come to pass they "would be swept from the House." The artisans of the country, he declared, would not support them but would be for "the Monarchy and the Empire."[4] Writing to a Mr. Charles Atwood he said: "I entirely agree with you that a union between the Conservative party and the Radical masses offers the only means by which we can preserve the Empire. Their interests are identical: united they form the nation."[5] "Two great existences," he said at another time, "had been blotted out of the history of England—the Monarch and the multitude." The privileges of

[1] *The Pocket Disraeli*, p. 77.

[2] *Wisdom of Disraeli*, p. 36-37.

[3] *Beaconsfield's Speeches*, vol. ii, p. 528.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 112: 1180.

[5] Monypenny and Buckle, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 88.

the masses and the prerogatives of the Crown had in former years gone hand in hand but their rights since 1832 had been trampled upon by a selfish Whig oligarchy and he considered it a part of his mission to restore them to their rightful places. This restoration, he maintained, had been achieved by the Act of 1867.[1]

As to whether events justified the great Tory leader's faith in the Conservative working-man has been a matter of some debate. The general opinion is that on the whole the workers have amply proved their loyalty to Tory principles. The fact that the Conservative party during twenty-seven out of forty-eight years prior to 1922 have occupied the Treasury Bench in the House of Commons may be regarded as partly due, at least, to the votes of the wage-earners. Without their support at the polling-booth such a result would hardly have been possible.[2] To be sure, the election of 1868 resulted in a Conservative defeat and it is the opinion of Lord Hugh Cecil that the Conservatives in that year were not aided by Mr. Disraeli's Reform Act.[3] This was naturally a disappointment and seemed at the time to refute the claims which had been made by the Tory leader. The workers did not display that sense of appreciation which had been expected. The rebuff was the more marked because of the nature of the campaign appeal which the Conservatives made. They went before the electors on a platform which was designed particularly for the masses. One of their pronouncements asserted that it had long been an article of the Tory creed "that between rich and poor, high and low, there is too little of everyday intercourse. . . ."

[1] *Beaconsfield's Speeches*, vol. ii, p. 527.

[2] Of course the support of Liberal Unionists because of the Irish question contributed to Conservative victories during the last two decades of the nineteenth century.

[3] Lord Hugh Cecil, *Conservatism* (London, 1919), p. 71.

In London and the great industrial centers there was a gulf between employer and employee. The wage-earners were herded together in wretched and inaccessible quarters. They were without schools and the common decencies of life. Wholesome amusements were lacking and debauchery resulted. The election appeal then proceeds as follows:

> These things have long been to the Tory party sources of anxiety and uneasiness, and they have laboured . . . to mitigate the evil. The Ten-Hours' Bill, a Tory measure, put an end to that system of continuous toil and ignorance which Mr. Bright and the section of the Liberal party which he represents did their best to perpetuate in the factories; and through Tory exertions some of the more obnoxious of the clauses in the new Poor-Law have been repealed. And now, in order that the workingmen may be able to look after their own interests the Tories have received them within the pale of the Constitution to an extent which their rivals never dreamed of; and to which, when the Reform Bill of 1867 was brought forward, Mr. Gladstone and his friends offered all the opposition in their power.
>
> Here then, in brief, is the Tory programme—necessarily short, unavoidably simple—which, for thirty years and more, being, as a party, in opposition, they were constrained, whenever elections came around, to reproduce for the consideration of the constituencies. But the Tories are now in office; they have been in office two years, and they are in a position to argue from what in that space of time they succeeded in doing, to what they are prepared to do if the country pronounce in their favour.[1]

Nothing daunted by the reversal of 1868, Mr. Disraeli turned his attention to the organization of Conservative Working-men's clubs. The election of 1874, six years later, justified his conviction that "the Conservative work-

[1] *Blackwood's Magazine,* 1868 (vol. 104), p. 624.

ing-man was not a myth but a reality." As the years progressed he and the party continued more and more to acquire the confidence and esteem of the masses. The tie which bound them to the Conservatives was much strengthened when, in 1874, Mr. Disraeli at the head of a compact majority began the enactment of a long list of Tory social reforms. In that year an Artisans Dwellings Act,[1] and a Factories Act [2] limiting the employment of children were placed on the statute-book.[3] In 1875 two measures which secured the right to strike and were favourable to trade unions became laws. In the same year the spirit of reform was seen in a Public Health Act,[4] and the Plimsoll Act which protected merchant seamen. In 1876 the latter measure gave way to the comprehensive Merchant Shipping Act [5] which more satisfactorily provided for the safety of seamen. Other legislation for elevating "the condition of the people" included the Education Act of 1876 which recognized the principle of compulsory education.[6] Although these measures did not bear the imprint of Mr. Disraeli's own hand they had his sanction and support. This record of achievement together with his earlier expressed views has led to the observation that England today would have no social problem if "Providence could have made Disraeli a dictator in the early thirties." [7]

Not only did electoral and social reforms command his interest but various utterances would indicate an equal cap-

[1] 37 & 38 Vict., ch. 36.

[2] 37 & 38 Vict., ch. 44.

[3] 38 & 39 Vict., ch. 86 and 38 & 39 Vict., ch. 90.

[4] 38 & 39 Vict., ch. 55.

[5] 39 & 40 Vict, ch. 80.

[6] 39 & 40 Vict., ch. 79.

[7] F. E. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

acity for a sympathetic understanding of the Irish problem. In one of his Parliamentary speeches he described the Irish as "that dense population in extreme distress" with "an established Church which was not their church and a territorial aristocracy, the richest of whom lived in distant capitals. Thus they had a starving population, an absentee aristocracy and an alien church." The only obvious remedy was revolution; but that was not possible "because Ireland was connected with another and more powerful country. . . . The connection with England thus became the cause of the present state of Ireland." England, he continued, "logically was in the odious position of being the cause of all the misery in Ireland. What, then, was the duty of an English Minister? To effect by his policy all those changes which a revolution would do by force." [1]

Other instances of his capacity to detect the signs of the times could be quoted. An example of this was his appreciation of the growing power of the press. He anticipated that political phenomenon in British politics which has been peculiarly in evidence during and since the World War and which has been described by Mr. A. G. Gardiner in a much discussed article entitled "The Twilight of Parliament,"[2] wherein the writer describes a Prime Minister as being more concerned in seeking the support of the daily press than that of the House of Commons. According to Mr. Disraeli, "the House of Commons that has absorbed all other powers in the State will in all probability fall more rapidly than it rose." The power which was to bring about such a decline was explained in the following words:

Public opinion has a more direct, a more comprehensive, a more efficient organ for its utterances than a body of men

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 72: 1016.

[2] *Atlantic Monthly*, 1921 (vol. 128), pp. 248-255.

sectionally chosen. The Printing Press is a political element unknown to classic or feudal times. It absorbs in a great degree the duties of the Sovereign, the Priest, the Parliament; it construes, it educates, it discusses.[1]

An article in the *Spectator* points out how Mr. Disraeli's prophecy has been realized.[2] Further evidence of the decline of the lower House is to be found in the recent protests of members who complain that bills are forced through without due Parliamentary consideration. "We shall soon get down to Latin countries," complained Mr. Ormsby Gore, "where they have legislatures that do not legislate."[3] The political acumen displayed by Disraeli in this matter is all the more remarkable because his assertions were made, as Sir Geoffrey Butler in his lectures on *The Tory Tradition* reminds us, "at a time when Parliament reached its highest esteem."[4]

The *Spectator* in discussing Mr. Disraeli's prognosis ascribed to him a "marvelous insight into the working" of the British "political system." To a greater extent than any of his contemporaries "he felt far more clearly the . . . . 'very pulse of the machine.'"[5]

Further proof of an acute political forwardness and a sensing of the future is to be seen in his remarks on the subject of women's suffrage. "In a country governed by a woman," he once observed in the House of Commons, and where women were allowed "not only to hold land, but to be a lady of the manor and hold legal court, where a woman

[1] *The Pocket Disraeli*, p. 46.

[2] The *Spectator*, April 5, 1919, pp. 416-417.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th ser., vol. 144: 500.

[4] G. G. G. Butler, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

[5] The *Spectator*, April 5, 1919, pp. 416-417.

by law may be a church-warden," it was difficult to understand why she should not have "a right to vote." [1]

During his later years the affairs of Empire commanded a considerable share of his time and interest. *Sanitas sanitatum omnia sanitas* made way for *Imperium.* Not alone domestic reform but the Suez Canal, India and the Berlin Congress dominated the scene. To find in Lord Beaconsfield's policy of imperialism anything akin to the spirit of Tory Democracy would be a barren task. Some of his earlier interests in foreign affairs, however, denoted a capacity for a generous and liberal outlook. His expressions relative to England's attitude towards America during the Civil War,[2] his sympathetic speech in the House of Commons on the occasion of President Lincoln's assassination,[3] and his adherence to the principle of arbitration in connection with the *Alabama* claims,[4] afford evidence of an enlightened outlook. But his attitude towards the oppressed nationalities of Eastern Europe cannot be referred to with the same degree of satisfaction.

What, then, was the legacy of Disraeli? What were the enduring and lasting results of his eventful political career? Setting aside his great schemes of Empire and his victories in the field of diplomacy, it is to be noted that he impressed a progressive stamp on the political creed of the Conservative party and formed a distinct school of statesmanship. "He supplied to the young Conservatives of fifty years ago the fire of a great ideal," to use the words of Sir John Marriott.[5] He re-made Toryism in new forms. After years of effort his party ceased to be identified with a single and

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 3rd ser., vol. 99: 950.

[2] *Annual Register,* vol. 108, p. 9.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates,* 3rd ser., vol. 178: 1246.

[4] Monypenny and Buckle, *op. cit.,* vol. v, p. 177.

[5] The *Times* (weekly edition), March 13, 1924, p. 291.

exclusive class. He succeeded in winning the affectionate regard of the people as a whole. All classes of the population, even to this hour, do him reverence. The celebration of Primrose Day annually by the multitude is an eloquent testimony of the esteem in which he is still held. His sympathy with the wage-earners and his success in winning their support for Toryism made him the saviour of his party. He snatched from the Liberals the monopoly which they had previously enjoyed of posing as the sole champions of progress and he identified the Conservative party with the cause of reform. To elevate the condition of the people became an integral part of Tory policy. He wanted to see the labourer better fed, better clothed, better housed and better taught. This was a necessary basis for maintaining the Empire and the institutions of the country. Thus the nation was best assured against revolution from within and attack from without.

He effected a closer union between the Throne and the masses. He strove to make it clear that the Sovereign was more concerned for the welfare of the people than were the oligarchs of Parliament. To him must be given no small share of recognition for stamping a tradition so indelibly upon the imagination of the workers, that when a Labour Government assumed office forty-two years after his death, the capitalist and not the King regarded the event with apprehension.[1] The prerogatives and interests of the latter were in no manner threatened.

Not only social reform but electoral reform is a part of the Disraelian legacy. He performed the feat of inducing his party to disavow their previous opposition and pass a

[1] Mr. J. H. Thomas, a member of the MacDonald Ministry, in a speech delivered 28 Jan. 1924, said that the two persons in England who were least apprehensive over the advent of the Labour Government were the King and the Prince of Wales. The *Spectator*, Feb. 2, 1924, p. 147.

reform bill stronger than the one they defeated the year before. His object was to win victory at the polls. The principle involved was that of trusting the people. And this programme had the desired effect of imparting a new life and vitality to the party organism. When Mr. Disraeli joined his fortunes to those of the Tories he found a party impotent and sterile, suffering from that sense of bewilderment and helplessness which generally results from continued political reversals; a party moribund with its face turned towards the past, incapable of adjusting itself to the new order and hence doomed to perpetual defeat. He took his party in hand and educated it. He made it a truly national and popular party.

Although he led the Tories boldly along the paths of popular government and social reform, he was, before his death, acclaimed as the very embodiment of Toryism. This radical Jew and eccentric parliamentarian was finally reverenced by his followers as a sort of tutelary deity. Carlyle once said that "he led the members of his party by the nose as if they were helpless, mesmerized cattle."

It is by no means to be implied that all the Conservatives gave their adherence and sanction to everything that had been advocated or hoped for by their leader. His programme was only partly accomplished. The die-hards were still a potent factor and had to be reckoned with. Many of them had never been reconciled to the Reform Bill of 1867. Others had refused, or simply were unable, to rid themselves of a distrust of the lower classes. And with the passing of the Tory Premier the forces of reaction strove to undo much of his work. Mr. Harold Gorst in his volume containing an account of the life and work of Lord Beaconsfield takes cognizance of this and laments the fact that the principles of Tory Democracy had not gained a more complete and permanent ascendancy within the domain of the Conserva-

tive party during the regime of the great political master. "It grows here and there" we read, "but now that the educator has passed away it would appear that Tory Democracy is dying for want of nutrition stifled by the thick growth of the old Toryism that chokes its progress. If Disraeli could rise from his ashes he would have to begin all over again. He would be compelled to plunge into the old struggle against the aristocratic element." [1]

[1] Harold Gorst, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

CHAPTER III

Lord Randolph Churchill and the Fourth Party

Lord Randolph Churchill "was one of those who with keen foresight and bright sagacity early formed the idea that the Conservative party to be a party at all, must be a party of progress and with the Liberal Unionists must found their influence upon the hearts and trust of the people."—The Earl of Derby at a Unionist meeting, January 24, 1895. The *Times*, January 25, 1895.

A few days after Lord Randolph Churchill's resignation in 1886, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, the *Pall Mall Gazette* issued one of its occasional "Extra" supplements, which was largely confined to an account of his political career. Among other items it was stated that "Disraeli's mantle fell upon Lord Randolph and it is his ambition to educate the Tory Party to democratic things which even Lord Beaconsfield never dreamed of." [1] The view that Lord Randolph Churchill was the principal legatee of the Disraelian tradition has been generally accepted. The *Spectator*, which was never friendly to the pretensions of Tory Democracy and its able exponent during the eighties, expressed the view that most Tories who were looking for Disraeli's successor thought they discerned in Lord Randolph the one who possessed the requisite qualities.[2] In a sense he was an understudy. The *Spectator* once referred to "Lord Randolph's imitation of Disraeli." [3] Even his speeches and letters were similar. In one of his Birming-

[1] *Pall Mall Gazette* (extra no. 31), Dec. 31, 1886, p. 6.

[2] The *Spectator*, June 20, 1885, p. 805.

[3] *Ibid.*, Dec. 25, 1886, p. 825.

ham addresses, for instance, he concluded with the following Disraelian phrase: "To rally the people around the Throne, to unite the Throne with the people, a loyal Throne and a patriotic people, that is our policy and that is our faith."[1] His political stategy, likewise, was patterned after that of Disraeli, as the *Daily Telegraph* once observed. This paper further remarked that these two men held each other in the highest esteem.[2]

That Lord Randolph regarded himself as having been born politically under Mr. Disraeli's star is indicated in an article which he wrote for the *Fortnightly Review* on the occasion of the unveiling of the Earl of Beaconsfield's statue. In this contribution he lamented the decline which had been going on in the Conservative ranks since the passing of the great leader and indicated that Tory Democracy alone could restore its former power and influence. The leadership of the party was discussed at length with more than a hint that if heroic measures were necessary he himself was available. Writing in oracular style he declared: "But the Tory Democracy may yet exist; the elements for its composition may only require to be collected; that labour may some day be effected by the man, whoever he may be, upon whom the mantle of Elijah has descended."[3] At the time he was very much concerned lest "Elijah's Mantle" might fall on Sir Stafford Northcote whose political principles he considered opposed to those of Tory Democracy. When it was announced that Sir Stafford Northcote was to be the chief figure at the unveiling of Lord Beaconsfield's statue he addressed a communication to the *Times* protesting against such an arrangement.[4] In another letter to the same paper

[1] *Birmingham Daily Post,* April 17, 1884, p. 5.

[2] *Daily Telegraph,* Jan. 25, 1885, p. 3.

[3] *Fortnightly Review,* 1883 (vol. 39), p. 621.

[4] The *Times,* March 29, 1883, p. 9. (This letter was signed "A Tory.")

a few days later he expressed doubts as to Sir Stafford's ability as a leader.[1] The communication referred to his negative character in a tone of grave misgiving. A third epistle appeared a week later in which the demoralization of the Conservative party again received his solicitious attention.[2] In the meantime he was constantly giving expression to his appreciation of everything Disraelian. He feared they would never look upon his like again. His loss to the party was irreparable. "Oh, if Lord Beaconsfield were alive," was the prayer which he said went up in those days of feeble Tory leadership.[3]

In many quarters Lord Randolph's pretensions were ridiculed. That he inherited only the less desirable qualities of Disraeli was frequently asserted. The *Spectator,* commenting on an intemperate speech which he had made, said that his only Disraelian trait was one of "parliamentary escapades such as Disraeli spurned in his later life."[4] In a later number the same periodical pronounced him a "degenerate imitator of Disraeli."[5] "Does he fancy himself a sort of revived Disraeli?" asked the Birmingham *Daily Post.* "Possibly, but it is very much as if he had borrowed a suit of Lord Beaconsfield's old clothes only to show that he could not make them fit. . . . As an imitator he is but a sorry piece of pinchbeck" was the judgment of this Liberal organ.[6] These opinions, of course, were distorted by partisan strife and political prejudice. But they serve to reveal the attitude of the reactionary Tory as well as the Liberal press, both of which displayed an equal degree of hostility.

[1] The *Times,* April 2, 1883, p. 8.

[2] *Ibid.,* April 9, 1883, p. 8.

[3] *Fortnightly Review,* 1883 (vol. 39), p. 614.

[4] The *Spectator,* May 16, 1885, vol. 58, p. 63.

[5] *Ibid.,* 1887, vol. 60, p. 4.

[6] Birmingham *Daily Post,* April 16, 1884, p. 4.

A more sobered judgment and one which has been matured by the lapse of time is that of Mr. F. E. Smith (now Lord Birkenhead). In his volume entitled *Unionist Policy,* which appeared in 1913, he expressed the view that these two leaders differed in respect to their talents but agreed in the essential spirit of Tory Democracy. This prominent Unionist further asserted that Lord Randolph reaped where Disraeli had sown. The former, he went on to say, "built without knowing it a somewhat airy edifice on the solid foundations which Disraeli had laid down."[1] The view that Lord Randolph continued the work of Disraeli, although in a more substantial manner than Mr. Smith seemed to admit, has found frequent expression. According to the *Pall Mall Gazette* he carried out the idea of Tory Democracy more completely and fully than Lord Beaconsfield ever intended.[2] Another contemporary once observed that "it seemed as if Disraeli had only come to make the way clearer for this man with . . . . his radical adaptation of Tory policy to modern needs."[3] In the opinion of Mr. Herbert Vivian, a perusal of the speeches of Lord Randolph is sufficient to show the reader how great an advance his ideas presented over those of Disraeli.[4] "He brought up to date Disraeli's education of the Tory Party," is the view of Mr. Alexander Mackintosh.[5]

That there is a basis for this estimate may be seen by an examination of the article already referred to—"Elijah's Mantle"—in which Lord Randolph urged the necessity of developing and perfecting the Disraelian programme. Unless the

[1] F. E. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

[2] *Pall Mall Gazette* (extra no. 31), Dec. 31, 1886, p. 6.

[3] *Saturday Review,* Jan. 26, 1895, p. 115.

[4] *Fortnightly Review,* 1906 (vol. 86), p. 896.

[5] Alexander Mackintosh, *From Disraeli to Lloyd George* (London, 1921), pp. 68-69.

policies and principles of the Tory party [he wrote] should undergo a surprising development, unless the secret of Lord Beaconsfield's theory of government is sown broadcast among the people, unless the mantle of Elijah should fall upon some one who is capable enough and fortunate enough . . . to bring to perfection those schemes of imperial rule and of social reform which Lord Beaconsfield had only time to dream of, to hint at and to sketch—

—unless such a programme were undertaken, the writer maintained, a great opportunity would be missed with consequent disaster for the party.[1] That he desired to attire the Disraelian programme in a more modern garb may be seen from a letter addressed to Lord Salisbury urging him to adopt an advanced scheme of social reform. He proposed that the party should plan to capture the town electorate as well as that of the counties. This, he wrote, "could only be done by an active progressive—I risk the word—a democratic policy, a casting off and a burning of those old worn out aristocratic and class garments from which the Derby-Dizzy lot, with their following of county families could never, or never cared, to extricate themselves."[2]

To what extent Lord Randolph Churchill conformed to or elaborated the political fashions established by Disraeli may be difficult to determine. However that may be there can be no doubt that he exemplified to the full all that is signified in the term "Tory Democracy." Mr. Bradlaugh once remarked in the House of Commons that he was its leader.[3] He was the "champion of Tory Democracy", the *Times* observed on the occasion of his death.[4]

[1] *Fortnightly Review*, 1883 (vol. 39), p. 621.

[2] W. S. Churchill, *Lord Randolph Churchill* (New York, 1906), vol. ii, p. 8.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 321 : 404.

[4] The *Times*, January 25, 1895, p. 6.

When did Lord Randolph first give evidence of those qualities which were to identify him with Tory Democracy? There are some who profess to see in his earliest political utterances the elements of that creed with which his name was to be so intimately associated. A leading article in the *Morning Post,* which appeared on the day following his death, recalled the fact that at the very beginning of his career he asserted that "the principles of true Conservatism" consisted in a "gradual, increasing progress adhering strictly to the lines of a well-founded constitution."[1] When he decided to stand for Woodstock in 1874 his election address stated that his politics were "strictly in accordance with those of the great leaders of the Conservative party." The only suggestion of Tory Democracy which this pronouncement contained was the assurance that he would give his "best and most earnest assistance" to "any measure that would ameliorate the condition of the working-classes."[2] An examination of *Hansard* during his first years in Parliament does not reveal many clues to his political opinions. His attendance was irregular and his interest in public affairs seemed to be almost negligible. He made one or two inconsequential speeches on the local affairs of Oxford and Woodstock. His defense of Quarter Sessions and his denunciation of the Public Worship Act as a blow at the Church indicated that he was a fairly good old-fashioned Tory. On the other hand he gave some evidence of a latent Tory Democracy when he voted in 1874 for Sir Charles Dilke's bill which enabled labourers to obtain small holdings. Also in his early political career he supported Mr. Gladstone's proposals for extending the Employers' Liability Act.[3] Outside of Parliament he made a speech

[1] The *Morning Post,* Jan. 25, 1895, p. 5.

[2] Harold Gorst, *The Fourth Party* (London, 1906), p. 17.

[3] *Speeches of the Right Hon. Lord Randolph Churchill,* edited by L. J. Jennings (London and New York, 1889), vol. i, p. xxiii.

in 1877 in which he eulogized the Irish members and spoke a word in extenuation of their obstructionist methods which he attributed to their just grievances. He also favoured a more conciliatory policy towards Ireland, all of which quite scandalized his father, who was a man of strict Tory convictions and moreover had at one time been Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He immediately wrote a letter of apology for his son to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, who was at that time Chief Secretary for Ireland, explaining that "either Randolph must be mad or have been singularly affected with local champagne." [1] It soon became evident, however, to the Duke of Marlborough that his son was determined to go his own way.

A further exhibition of liberalism and independence at the outset of his career was in connection with the Eastern question. Although he took no part in the debates, it is quite evident that his convictions were not in accord with the policy of his party. He differed from Lord Beaconsfield in that he had a deep sympathy for the oppressed peoples of Southeastern Europe. He was favourable to the liberties of Bulgaria and the other Balkan States. Party ties were held in such slight esteem that he wrote to Sir Charles Dilke suggesting that the Liberal party support him in a resolution which he was prepared to make from the Conservative side of the House, proposing the Government's sympathy with the idea of ending Turkish rule in the Christian provinces of the Near East.[2] His conceptions of foreign policy at that time and later were rather in accord with the Liberal formula of peace, retrenchment and reform. It was believed by some that he privately sided with Gladstone with respect to the Eastern question and the editor of the *Fortnightly Review* in 1887 went so far as to say, that Lord

[1] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 92.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 101-102.

Randolph believed "in peace-at-any-price."[1] He was convinced that England should keep out of European entanglements as much as possible,[2] an opinion which shows that the admiration he always felt for Disraeli's domestic policy did not extend to the imperialistic programme of his later career.

After the Conservative overthrow in 1880 Lord Randolph Churchill's democratic instincts became more pronounced. Mr. Harold Gorst says that following this event "he was more firmly a democrat in principle than ever before and certainly a great deal less tolerant of the selfish and exclusive policy of the old Tory party."[3] Lord Randolph once declared that the election of 1880 taught him three lessons. The first was that the people of England desired a peaceful foreign policy; secondly, they demanded that public affairs be administered in an economical and efficient manner; and thirdly, they wanted legislation which "should reform all the admitted abuses in our social system."[4]

In the new Parliament which convened in 1880 he displayed the same attitude towards Egyptian affairs which he

[1] *Fortnightly Review,* 1887 (vol. 47), p. 153.

The statement that Lord Randolph believed in peace-at-any-price and was a Gladstonian in his foreign policy can hardly be justified. Speaking in Manchester in March, 1886, he criticized Mr. Gladstone's policy in dealing with Russia because it was not firm enough. He declared that the situation with Russia had been critical because Mr. Gladstone was not respected abroad. "The Government of Russia thought that so long as . . . Mr. Gladstone was in power they had only to ask and to receive." But upon the accession of Lord Salisbury it was immediately realized that although there was no "hostility to the great Russian Empire" the new Government "were determined that England should possess her just rights" and that British interests would be "protected at all costs." He added that because of these conditions "the Government of Russia respected the Government of Lord Salisbury and persons who respect each other always remain friends."—*Speeches,* vol. ii, p. 16.

[2] *Fortnightly Review,* 1887 (vol. 47), p. 153.

[3] Harold Gorst, *op. cit.,* p. 72.

[4] The *Morning Post,* Jan. 25, 1895, p. 5.

had previously shown for the Balkans. Rightly or wrongly he regarded the revolt of Arabi Pasha as an effort to establish constitutional freedom. Mr. Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, who encouraged Lord Randolph to see the matter in a light favourable to the so-called nationalist movement, has related how generously he responded to his appeals for assistance.[1] He showed his sympathy by a financial contribution and in pleading the Egyptian cause in Parliament "with earnestness and even with passion."[2] In his speeches throughout the country he sought a "favourable consideration" for "the cause of the exile Arabi, the cause of desolate Egypt" and "the great cause of freedom in the East."[3] "The revolution of Arabi" he declared in his Edinburgh speech "was the movement of a nation."[4] He said that he disagreed with those who were "vitally interested in upholding the stock-exchange ring when they asserted that constitutional government" was impossible in Egypt. They had said the same thing about Bulgaria and Roumania, he continued, but their prophecies had been belied by subsequent events.[5] Nor did Lord Randolph's position with respect to this question change. It was the same in 1888 as it had been in 1880. From first to last he condemned a policy of "muddle and meddle" in Egypt.[6]

The annexation schemes in South Africa aroused a similar democratic interest. In a letter to Sir Henry Wolff in 1880 he suggested that the members of the Fourth Party, since they were unpledged, should "pronounce for the independence of the Boers and protest against British blood

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, 1906 (vol. 59), pp. 403-406.

[2] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 226.

[3] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. i, p. 85.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 72.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 81.

[6] *Ibid.*, vol. i, intro. p. xi

and treasure being wasted in reducing a gallant nationality which is perfectly able to take care of itself." [1] Other portions of this correspondence, however, raise a question in the reader's mind as to whether the principle of self-determination of small nationalities or the parliamentary opportunity presented, was the dominating motive behind his apparently laudable suggestion. But protests of a similar sort on other occasions indicate that there was much sincerity in the plan which he proposed to the unresponsive Sir Henry Wolff.

The most important consideration in any account of Lord Randolph Churchill during the early eighties has to do with the formation and activities of the Fourth Party. A description of this unique political body is to be found in Mr. Winston Churchill's biography of his father. Mr. Harold Gorst, the son of Sir John Gorst, has also explained its origin and history. The sole members of this group were Lord Randolph Churchill, Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, Mr. (later Sir) John Gorst and Mr. Arthur (later Lord) Balfour. Sir Henry Wolff has been described as the originator of the party.[2] According to another account it had its beginning in a speech by Lord Randolph Churchill opposing the admission of Mr. Bradlaugh to the House of Commons.[3] In any event it owed its later fame to Lord Randolph's energy and audacity. "That strange and eccentric creation was the work of Churchill's brain," the *Daily Telegraph* once observed.[4] To be the leader of a few independent parliamentary free lances was a role for which he was peculiarly qualified.

The relation of Mr. Balfour to this coterie was always a

[1] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 196-197.

[2] *Fortnightly Review*, 1906 (vol. 86), p. 897.

[3] *National Review*, 1895, p. 121.

[4] *Daily Telegraph*, Jan. 25, 1895, p. 3.

matter of some uncertainty. According to Lady Randolph Churchill in her reminiscences considerable impatience was felt because of the indefiniteness he exhibited. Mr. Balfour, she writes, never seemed to know whether he was a member or not.[1] His politics at that stage of his career seemed to have been involved in "philosophic doubt." The suggestion has been made that he identified himself with the "Souls," as they were sometimes called, because it amused him. He was not inclined to take the group very seriously. He humorously indicated on one occasion that he was its leader. "Indeed," he remarked, "none of us were ever quite clear who was leader and who were followers." [2] Sir Henry Lucy has described him as "the odd man of the party." [3] Mr. Churchill thinks that he became a member because it gave him an opportunity to join with the others in their opposition to the leadership of Sir Stafford Northcote who shared that responsibility with Lord Salisbury.[4] This dual arrangement was regarded as unfortunate and the attacks which the Fourth Party made on Sir Stafford in the House of Commons made it possible for Mr. Balfour to be of some service, as he thought, to the claims of his distinguished relative. When Lord Randolph in turn came into sharp conflict with Lord Salisbury the Fourth Party and Mr. Balfour came to the parting of the ways.

Just how much of a Tory Democrat Mr. Balfour was cannot be easily determined. Mr. Harold Gorst thinks "he was less of a Tory Democrat than the rest of his friends but had sufficient sympathy with their political views to join readily in most of their proceedings in Parliament." [5] Mr.

[1] *Reminiscences of Lady Randolph Churchill* (London, 1908), p. 93.

[2] *Fortnightly Review,* 1906 (vol. 86), p. 898.

[3] *Contemporary Review,* 1906 (vol. 89), p. 236.

[4] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.,* vol. i, p. 228.

[5] H. Gorst, *op. cit.,* p. 248.

Herbert Vivian said some years later that he was "neither Tory nor Democrat." [1] What Lord Randolph thought in 1891 is indicated in the following letter which he wrote his wife upon learning that Mr. Balfour had been made leader in the House of Commons by Lord Salisbury. "So Arthur Balfour is really leader," he wrote, "and Tory Democracy the genuine article is at an end." [2] A few years later, however, he gave him his full support. "Since Balfour has taken the lead," he said, "I have had nothing to do but back him up." [3]

What relation did Sir Henry Wolff sustain to the Fourth Party and Tory Democracy? Although Sir Henry Lucy has described him as the founder of the party [4] there is little evidence that he shared the advanced views of Lord Randolph Churchill and Mr. Gorst. The most pronounced instance of his progressivism consisted in joining with Mr. Gorst in the issuance of a manifesto which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review* of November, 1882, demanding the reorganization of the Conservative party on a more democratic basis. Even here it is the hand of Mr. Gorst that is most in evidence. This pronouncement which was signed by "Two Conservatives" arraigned the Conservative organization of the time because it was dominated by the "aristocracy and landowners" who feared and despised the masses. The article goes on to say that if the Conservatives were to regain their ascendancy they must "become a popular party." [5] But such sentiments did not often proceed from Sir Henry Wolff. In his parliamentary utter-

[1] *Fortnightly Review*, 1906 (vol. 86), p. 895.

[2] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 452.

[3] *Saturday Review*, Jan. 26, 1895, p. 116.

[4] H. W. Lucy, *A Diary of the Salisbury Parliament* (London, 1892), p. 185.

[5] M. Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties* (New York, 1902), vol. i, p. 263.

ances there is little evidence of any strong attachment to the principles of Tory Democracy. He was interested in diplomatic affairs, and the navy,[1] but social and political reforms did not much concern him. He later turned out to be a "bad friend to Churchill."[2]

It was Sir Henry Wolff who first suggested the formation of the Primrose League,[3] which has been called "that strange product of Democratic Toryism."[4] This political organization which has been accounted one of "the most permanently successful in English history"[5] was proposed by Wolff on the occasion of the unveiling of Lord Beaconsfield's statue. It was essentially the product of the Fourth Party and like its progenitor was greeted at first with much ridicule.

The objects of the Primrose League, as Lord Randolph once explained, were "the maintenance of an ancient monarchy, the consolidation" of the Empire, the preservation of the Church, "the vigilant guardianship of popular rights, the timely extension of these rights . . . . and the vigorous and earnest promotion of every social reform which can in any degree raise the character and condition of the English people." These, he added, "were the objects of Lord Beaconsfield's existence" and they would be prosecuted by the members of the League "in his memory and in his name."[6] Mr. Harold Gorst substantially agrees with

[1] See his speeches as reported in *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 184: 185, 296, 421, 666.

[2] *Private Diaries of Sir Algernon West* (London, 1922), p. 317.

[3] Montgomery and Cambray, *Dictionary of Political Phrases and Allusions* (London, 1906), p. 279. See statement of Reginald Lucas: "The origin of the League was in the brain of Sir Henry Drummond Wolff." *Lord Glenesk and the Morning Post* (London, 1910), p. 299.

[4] *Edinburgh Review*, 1906 (vol. 204), p. 18.

[5] H. Paul, *op. cit.*, vol. iv, p. 192.

[6] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. i, p. 209.

this statement and adds that the mission of the League was to perpetuate "the principles of Tory Democracy."[1] But the impression one gets from an account of its proceedings is that it was more Tory than democratic. Support and eulogy of the Church, imperialism and the House of Lords figured conspicuously in its celebrations.[2] It is quite true, however, as Lord Randolph boasted, that its membership was largely made up of the masses of the people.[3] Many titled ladies also were active in promoting its growth "nor did they disdain the company of any man with a vote."[4] Among its supporters was Lord Randolph's mother, the Duchess of Marlborough, who at one time was the President of the Ladies Grand Council. With its picturesque titles, its flowery associations and the mingling on occasion of the great and the lowly, it was the sort of thing which would have appealed peculiarly to the imagination of "Young England" forty years before. Its numerical growth was remarkable. By 1895 more than 1,250,000 members were enrolled.[5] In 1905 it had a membership of 1,725,000.

Coming now to a consideration of Mr. John Gorst's relations to the Fourth Party it is to be noted at the outset that no one of its members displayed a more consistent zeal for the principles of Tory Democracy than he did. It might also be observed that his interest grew rather than diminished until the time he severed his connection with the Conservative party. Indeed his withdrawal from the party was in the nature of a protest because in his opinion it no longer adhered to the Disraelian tradition.

[1] *Nineteenth Century,* 1902 (vol. 52), p. 1044.

[2] *National Review,* 1895 (vol. 24), pp. 777-778.

[3] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill,* vol. i, p. 208.

[4] H. Paul, *op. cit.,* vol. iv, p. 193.

[5] *National Review,* 1895 (vol. 24), p. 771.

Mr. Gorst was even less amenable to party discipline than Lord Randolph Churchill. In fact he once suggested that party regularity was subservient to good government. Strict party men, he said, "would vote as they were directed without knowing anything as to the merits of the question." [1] He steadily refused to sacrifice principle to expediency and was singularly indifferent to the emoluments of office. Because of his spirit of independence together with an incapacity to work with others he did not obtain that political success to which he was entitled by reason of his undoubted talents. Furthermore, his progressive and democratic convictions often brought him into conflict with the party leaders. These and other circumstances resulted in his being regarded as a "rather malcontent Tory." [2] As a matter of fact he preferred to be a lonely figure in politics. To be a voice crying in the wilderness was a congenial occupation.

In addition to his independence he had a temperament which was at once humanitarian and democratic. The distress and suffering of the disinherited never failed to appeal to his sympathies. Throughout his long public career he maintained both in and out of Parliament that it was the essential business of the State to correct by remedial legislation those abuses which were the causes of social and industrial misery.[3]

Mr. Gorst belonged to a family of wealth, and after a bril-

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th ser., vol. 124: 330.

[2] Bernard Holland, *Life of the Duke of Devonshire* (London, 1911), vol. ii, p. 269.

[3] See his articles: "Social Reform: the Obligation of the Tory Party," *Nineteenth Century*, 1903 (vol. 53), pp. 519-533; "Government and Reform," *Fortnightly Review*, 1905 (vol. 83), pp. 843-854. An account of an address in *Popular Science Monthly*, 1901 (vol. 60), pp. 50-57, *etc.* Also, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 255: 1481; 266: 1033. 4th ser., vol. 118: 1456; 118: 138; 123: 680; 123: 1350; 125: 193; 133:789; *etc., etc.*

liant career at Cambridge he travelled abroad. In 1860 he went to New Zealand where he was active in public affairs. Returning to England he entered Parliament in 1866 where he at once obtained recognition by reason of his encyclopaedic knowledge and his mastery of parliamentary practices. At the beginning of his public career he became an ardent disciple of Mr. Disraeli to whom in later years he was accustomed to refer as his "ancient master."[1] He was actively interested in party politics and in 1867 he presided at the first conference of the Conservative National Union. Following the defeat of the Conservatives in the elections of 1868 he was requested by Disraeli to assume the task of reorganizing the party machinery.[2] This he undertook to do on a popular and democratic basis. He set out in quest of the Conservative working-man and succeeded in enrolling large numbers in political clubs. Ostrogorski, who describes Mr. Gorst as "one of the most conspicuous statesmen" of that time, says that he took great pains "to attract the masses" to the party.[3] The good results of his work were manifest in the elections of 1874. According to an otherwise unfriendly account of his career in the *Saturday Review* he "proved himself an organizer of victory, for he gave Disraeli the first and last majority in his life."[4] In 1876 as honourary Secretary of the National Union, Mr. Gorst again undertook to reorganize the party along democratic lines by forming Conservative Working-men's Clubs in the larger manufacturing cities. His advanced ideas and poli-

[1] Mr. Harold Gorst says that "Disraeli was his one friend among the Conservative leaders." (H. Gorst, *The Fourth Party*, p. 36.) Mr. Winston Churchill is authority for the statement that of all the members of the Fourth Party "it was with Mr. Gorst" that Disraeli's "relations were most intimate." (W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 154.)

[2] Harold Gorst, *Beaconsfield*, p. 128.

[3] M. Ostrogorski, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 252.

[4] The *Saturday Review*, Apr. 8, 1916, p. 345.

cies, however, met with such opposition among the old Tory element that he resigned. Following the Conservative overthrow in 1880 Sir Stafford Northcote and Mr. W. H. Smith urged him to repair once more the party machinery. Forgetting the rebuffs to which he had been subjected he returned to the task of managing the Central Conservative Office and attempted to modernize and inject new life into the party organization. But when he discovered that he was not to enjoy the same freedom of action which Disraeli had formerly given him he retired a second time.[1] This was the situation when the opportunity presented itself of casting in his lot with the filibustering Fourth Party.

His son asserts that the reason he had for joining the Fourth Party was two-fold. He saw therein a certain tactical advantage and "he believed that his colleagues shared with him a keen determination to revive Disraeli's policy of social reform." The same authority further states that he found in Lord Randolph Churchill a "kindred spirit" who shared with him "the belief that a sound conservatism was compatible with humanity and progress, that the Tory party was in its essence intended to be a national party to whom the masses of the people could look with confidence for the protection and furtherance of their interests."[2] These two parliamentarians possessed between them qualities which were peculiarly effective in successfully realizing the objects of the Fourth Party. Sir Henry James once observed that Mr. Gorst was "a pointer to find game" and Lord Randolph Churchill "a grayhound to run it down."

That Lord Randolph entertained a high regard for Mr. Gorst is indicated by a statement made in the House of Commons in 1884 relative to their friendship and similarity of views.[3] How much he valued his assistance is seen in a

[1] H. Gorst, *The Fourth Party*, p. 36.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 246.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 293: 1248.

letter addressed to Sir Henry Wolff upon learning of Gorst's intention to go to India in 1883. He wrote that he was "terribly upset" at receiving the news. "To the Fourth Party," he declared, "it is ruin." [1]

At first these young Tories were not taken seriously. But gradually it became evident that they had a set of political principles which were not to be lightly dismissed. What were their principles and the objects for which they strove? A writer in the *National Review* has described Lord Randolph and his three companions as disciples of Disraeli, and their principles, he goes on to say, were similar to his rather than to those of the more orthodox Conservatives. They were in favour of "true progress and of all measures for the amelioration of the people." [2] Mr. Justin McCarthy says that the purpose which Lord Randolph Churchill had in mind was that of "revivifying and embodying in practical form Mr. Disraeli's idea of a Tory Democrat." [3] To promote Disraeli's policies and "to rescue his ideas from oblivion" was the object of the party according to Mr. Harold Gorst.[4] He also is authority for the statement that the Fourth Party was always inspired by the principles of Tory Democracy.[5]

An examination of *Hansard* creates the impression that one of their chief objects was to harass Mr. Gladstone and obstruct the business of the House of Commons. They were adepts in filibustering tactics. The method used by these self-constituted leaders has been described as "something between knight-errants and banditti who fight as

[1] H. Gorst, *The Fourth Party*, pp. 260-261.

[2] *National Review*, 1895 (vol. 24), p. 773.

[3] Justin McCarthy, *History of Our Own Times* (New York and London, 1903), vol. iii, p. 23.

[4] H. Gorst, *The Fourth Party*, p. 7.

[5] *Nineteenth Century*, 1903 (vol. 53), p. 139.,

guerillas under the Conservative banner." [1] This description is substantiated by the fact that during the session following the 1880 election Mr. Gorst spoke 105 times and asked 18 questions while Lord Randolph spoke 74 times and asked 21 questions.[2] They defended these methods on the ground that there was no other way in which they could adequately draw attention to their views. Lord Randolph in order to justify his procedure once quoted from an essay by Mr. Gladstone in which he had set forth the principle that a small party with strong convictions was warranted in adopting obstructionist methods. The House of Commons, according to the citation from Gladstone, was "beyond all things a free assembly and must be content to pay the price of freedom." [3]

The Employers' Liability Bill which the Gladstone Government introduced in 1880 afforded Lord Randolph and his friends the kind of opportunity which was well suited to their purposes. The Liberals expected the Opposition to show hostility to the measure. But the members of the Fourth Party, who considered the principle of the Bill in harmony with Tory Democracy, criticised it because it did not go far enough. Lord Randolph wanted the Bill made compulsory.[4] His associates in turn found fault with the proposed legislation because it was not sufficiently comprehensive.[5] In this manner a situation was produced not unlike that of 1867 when Mr. Disraeli favoured a franchise more extensive than that proposed by the Liberals. Such a procedure not only embarrassed the Government but seemed

[1] A. Lawrence Lowell, *Government of England* (New York, 1921), vol. i, p.. 550.

[2] The *Spectator*, Aug. 28, 1880, p. 1082.

[3] H. Gorst, *The Fourth Party*, p. 124.

[4] The *Times*, Oct. 21, 1867, p. 6.

[5] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 255: 519, 576.

to show the workers that they had more to expect from the Conservatives than from the Liberal party. It also offered the Churchill insurgents the chance to replace Sir Stafford Northcote by providing the real leadership of the Opposition during the debates.

Although the Fourth Party was small in numbers its members did not always work in harmony. In spite of their pleasant dinner parties, at which they arranged their plans, their relations to each other were at times rather strained. One rock on which the party very nearly split was that of the Franchise Bill of 1884. The members, however, composed their differences and during the last stages of the Bill they were directing their hostility against the Gladstone Government. They adopted the same tactics which they had employed during the passage of the Employers' Liability Act. They attacked the Franchise Bill because it was not broad enough. It was again their purpose in a small way to try to "dish the Whigs" by outbidding them; a method which was deplored by the *Times* in its editorial comment on the activities of "the more adventurous spirits of the party."[1]

During the debates on the Franchise Bill it was noticeable that Mr. Balfour was no longer acting with his former colleagues. A mild sensation was created in the House of Commons when some remarks by Lord Randolph on the proposed legislation provoked an ironical rejoinder from Mr. Balfour, who flatly contradicted the assertions which his former political associate had just made.[2] Although Mr. Balfour favoured the reform in a general way he displayed no great enthusiasm for it. Speaking on the proposed measure he made some suggestions in a meaningless fashion about proportional representaiton and women's suffrage.[3] On an-

[1] The *Times* (weekly edition), May 29, 1885, p. 12.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 288, pp. 1221-1222.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. 289: 617.

other occasion he announced that the Conservatives were just as sincere and eager for the Bill as the Liberals, provided there was a provision for a redistribution of seats.[1]

Sir Henry Wolff pointed out the anomalies which would result in urban constituencies if there was no provision for a redistribution measure.[2] He later moved an amendment that the Bill should not go into effect until a satisfactory redistribution feature had been added.[3] He also favoured additions which would make more ample franchise provisions for soldiers and sailors.[4]

As for Mr. Gorst, he consistently supported the measure throughout its entire career.[5] Like his companions, he suggested extending its provisions. He regretted that it excluded from the franchise those who had been released from prison. He insisted that when "a sentence had been expiated the criminal became a free man again" and was entitled to the full privileges of citizenship.[6] When Mr. Chaplin, the Conservative member from Mid Lincolnshire, argued against the inclusion of the Irish agricultural labourer within the scope of the proposed legislation Mr. Gorst assured the House that these remarks "did not represent the views of the entire Conservative Party." He quoted with approval the appeal which Mr. Gladstone had made to "trust the people" and he saw no reason why the people of Ireland should not be trusted as fully as those of any part of the United Kingdom.[7] Speaking on the subject of redistribution he expressed himself as favourable to such a pro-

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, vol. 288: 1223; vol. 293: 1410-1414.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 287: 1489-1490.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. 288: 1190-1191.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. 289: 595.

[5] *Nineteenth Century*, 1903 (vol. 53), p. 138.

[6] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 289: 1154-1155.

[7] *Ibid.*, vol. 287: 1113.

vision if it did not place in jeopardy the original Bill which he was prepared to support in any event. During the course of his speech he made an unfriendly allusion to Lord Randolph Churchill,[1] which aroused the latter's wrath and threatened to terminate the relations of the two leading members of the Fourth Party.

Lord Randolph's record in connection with the Bill was far from consistent. He himself confessed later that his conduct in this instance was marked by what he was pleased to describe as a rather "sharp curve."[2] At the outset he was hostile to the proposed reform. In the House of Commons during the early part of 1884, he contended that other legislation including local government reform should receive prior consideration.[3] In a speech at Leeds he maintained that the Bill was merely an electioneering device on the part of the Liberals.[4] Speaking at Edinburgh in December, 1883, he said that he had four objections to the proposed measure. The time, he declared, was not convenient; there was serious objection to increasing the Irish vote; the Government's motive was merely to divert attention from foreign affairs; and lastly there was no general demand for extending the franchise.[5] With respect to the latter point he said that if the workers marched on London and tore "down the railings of Hyde Park" and made other similar demonstrations there would be evidence of a real grievance which ought to be redressed.[6] As it was, there seemed to be a

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 293: 1148.

[2] Reginald Lucas, *Lord Glenesk and the Morning Post*, p. 303.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 285: 179.

[4] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. i, p. 165.

[5] The *Scotsman*, December 20, 1883, p. 5.

[6] Mr. Chamberlain in rather ingenious fashion pretended to see in this statement an incentive to violence. See *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 286: 851.

spirit of apathy and indifference. On this same occasion he made some unfortunate remarks regarding the intelligence of agricultural labourers which he said was "admittedly inferior" to that of the town population. He declared that he did not consider it wise or prudent "to chuck away precious political privileges among a mass of people who do not value them because they do not understand them."[1]

It was not long, however, before he changed his position. In a letter dated 9 June 1884, and addressed to his friend and admirer, Sir Algernon Borthwick (later Lord Glenesk), at that time the editor of the *Morning Post,* he wrote that he had acted on conviction but he soon learned that electoral reform had more public support than he had imagined, a statement which lends colour to the belief that expediency frequently dictated Lord Randolph's political actions. In a subsequent letter to the distinguished editor of the *Morning Post* he confessed that his opposition to the Bill "was a blunder too enormous to be described."[2] He did not improve matters much when he explained in Parliament that he had endeavoured to maintain a "mediatory" position and so use his good influences to prevent a "constitutional conflict" over the proposed reform, between the Commons and the House of Lords.[3] A more practical motive for this reversal was his decision to stand for Birmingham at the next election.[4] Another consideration was the fact that the Conservative leaders whom he regarded as enemies of himself and Tory Democracy were hostile to the measure. The fact

[1] The *Scotsman,* December 20, 1883, p. 5. A political pamphlet which appeared during the election of 1885 entitled "A Political Humbug or Half an Hour with Lord Randolph Churchill" made considerable use of this utterance. (G. W. Norma, *A Political Humbug or Half an Hour with Lord Randolph Churchill,* pp. 12-13.)

[2] Reginald Lucas, *Lord Glenesk and the Morning Post,* p. 303.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates,* 3rd ser., vol. 290, p. 867.

[4] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.,* vol. i, p. 340.

that "the old gang" opposed it was a good reason for him to endorse it.[1] Mr. Winston Churchill further suggests that he was influenced by Disraeli's example in 1867.[2] Lord Randolph writing to Mr. Wainright, M. P., in June, 1884, expressed the view that it was impossible for the Tories ever to oppose the extension of the franchise, because of the precedent established in 1867. He also pointed out in this communication that Mr. Disraeli in a speech before the Buckinghamshire electors in 1874 indicated that he was in favour of widening still further the franchise,[3] a circumstance to which he referred effectively during the House of Commons debates.[4]

Moved by these considerations he announced that he would support electoral reform if it was "dealt with honestly, genuinely and completely so as to provide a Parliament which shall really and fairly represent the English people." On such a procedure, he declared, "depends the character of the modern democracy." [5] He was continually recurring to the demand that the Bill should be comprehensive. The reform "should be dealt with completely" he said on one occasion.[6] At another time he criticised the proposed measure as "a very little Bill—a trumpery little Bill," he called it, "and certainly one that was not worthy of the designation of a great Reform Bill." [7] He suggested that the Government might have considered in this proposed legislation the matter of proportional representation and woman suffrage.[8] Lack of sincerity was charged in not dealing

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 290, p. 341.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 336.

[3] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 550.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 288: 859.

[5] The *Times*, April 16, 1884, p. 7.

[6] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 288: 1204.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 853.

[8] *Ibid.*, vol. 285: 177.

more fully with the problem and the Reform Bill of 1867 was referred to as an example of real franchise legislation.[1] In common with other Conservatives he demanded that suitable provision be made for a redistribution of seats.

He spoke cordially and at length in favour of the proposals to extend the franchise to the Irish agricultural labourers. This subjected him to attacks on the ground of inconsistency since he had announced only a short time before that it was "high time to pull up and concede nothing more to Mr. Parnell either on the land, or on the franchise or on local self government."[2] When a member of the House referred to his reversal of opinion he frankly admitted the fact[3] and addressed himself all the more vigorously to the task of having the Irish workers included within the scope of the measure. Speaking on an amendment by Mr. Broderick (Conservative) which would have excluded the agricultural labourers of Ireland, he said that he had "given much anxious thought to this question" and after listening to the debates on both sides he was convinced of the desirability of England holding out "to Ireland the generous hand of fellowship and to sow the seeds of conciliation." He did not believe that there was any "better method of sowing the seeds of conciliation than by sowing the seeds of complete political equality." He then directed his remarks to the Conservative leader, Mr. W. H. Smith, whose disparaging references to the Irish peasants living in mud-cabins accomodated the speaker with one of those opportunities which he always gladly seized. He observed that the franchise in England had "never been determined by Parliament with

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 287: 772.

[2] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. i, p. 90. Lord Randolph Churchill admitted that "this was a very imprudent sentence." See explanatory note, *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. i, p. 90.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 288: 854.

respect to the character of the dwelling house." To establish the suffrage on such a basis was, in his opinion, "arrogant" and "plutocratic." "The fact of a man living in a mud-cabin in Ireland" by no means proved that he was an incapable citizen. He contended that the Irish peasant, though living in a mud-cabin, was "often more suited to take an interest and a sound view of political questions than the English agricultural labourer."

The religious argument which had been advanced as a reason for not extending the franchise to the Irish agricultural worker was dismissed in the same characteristic manner. Continuing, he urged the Conservative members to support the proposals which he had presented because such action would be in harmony with the Tory policy which for one hundred years had favoured "equality of political rights between Ireland and England." He maintained that "it was undoubtedly the principle of Mr. Pitt at the time of the Union, and Mr. Pitt would have established complete equality of rights between Ireland and England if it had not been for the prejudices of the Court and the baneful influence of a too powerful monarch." He also declared that "it was the principle of the Reform Bill of 1867; and Mr. Disraeli in proposing the four pound rating franchise for Ireland, did so on the ground that that exactly represented the same class as were then enfranchised in England." In conclusion he appealed to Mr. Broderick to withdraw his amendment. He said that he made this request confidently because the right honourable Gentleman by his former expressions of opinions in the House showed that he belonged "to that more generous and advanced school which having emancipated itself from the traditions of an antiquated past desires to base the strength of the Tory Party upon the genuine and spontaneous affections of the people at large." [1]

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 288: 854-861.

This declaration naturally called forth much comment. Mr. Labouchere, who followed Lord Randolph, spoke of the strange diversity of opinion which separated "the noble Lord" from the occupants of the Front Opposition Bench who must have regarded with horror the sentiments which had just been uttered. He suggested that the principal motive actuating the member for Woodstock was that of getting votes.[1] Mr. McCartney was another member who had something to say about Lord Randolph's sudden conversion,[2] and Lord Claude Hamilton who spoke at the same time (May 20) said that he did not regard very highly the Tory Democracy which had just been presented to them and if that was a specimen of it he would respectfully decline to follow such a leader; that he preferred good old-fashioned directness, honesty and straight-forwardness. He assured his hearers that he could not approve of the noble Lord in his "efforts to catch a few stray votes at the general election" at the expense of party principles.[3]

Mr. Broderick's amendment was duly defeated by 322 to 137. The Bill was finally passed after an agreement had been reached between the leaders of both parties respecting the redistribution question. During its last stages it enjoyed the support of the Conservative chiefs, many of whom had been originally hostile to the proposal. This attitude was attacked not only by Lord Randolph Churchill,[4] but even the *Times* in 1884 was critical of the position assumed by Lord Salisbury and his associates during the early stages of the Bill.[5] A year later the weekly edition of the *Times* was pleased to say that "owing entirely to the action of

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 288: 903-904.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 900.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 862.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 1221.

[5] The *Times*, July 24, 1884, p. 9.

Lord Salisbury the greatest reform bill of the day became an accomplished fact." [1] And that orthodox organ of Conservative opinion, the staid *Quarterly Review*, remarked that "so far as electoral reform was concerned the Tory leaders had become as radical as any rational man could wish." [2] Of course the changed attitude on the part of the Tory leaders was due largely to the Gladstone Government's agreement to enact a redistribution measure. At the same time the vigorous initiative displayed by Lord Randolph and his fellow Tory Democrats was by no means a negligible factor in affecting the situation. They led the way and the rest of the party followed—and followed with rather faltering steps, as Mr. Chamberlain once remarked.

To give force and direction to what they considered to be the feeble and aimless leadership of the Conservative Opposition was one of the major objects of the Fourth Party.[3] There had been even in Disraeli's days of supremacy some "unbending Tories" who had refused to be "educated." [4] When the Earl of Beaconsfield passed off the scene they gained control of the party machinery and granted their favourites the rewards of office. To make matters worse "the old gang," as the ultra Tories were called, exhibited a lamentable degree of inactivity and ineptitude in carrying on the work of the Opposition. Old Toryism and incompetence sat above the gangway while Tory Democracy combined with energy and ability sat below.

The Conservative leader of the House of Commons, Sir Stafford Northcote, who was called the "goat" by the irreverent members of the Fourth Party, was a model of all the political amenities. He was staid, respectable, essen-

[1] The *Times* (weekly edition), Aug. 14, 1885, p. 7.

[2] *Quarterly Review*, 1885 (vol. 82), p. 137.

[3] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 145 147.

[4] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. i, pp. xx-xxi.

tially conservative and not in sympathy with the ideas of Tory Democracy. It was his timid and colourless if not reactionary type of leadership which provoked the Gorst-Wolff manifesto which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review* in 1882. Expressions of discontent and protest were by no means confined to the "Souls." The *Times* occasionally complained because Sir Stafford Northcote's speeches and their "much diluted criticism" of the Government had little effect on the masses of the voters.[1] But complaints of this sort were mild in comparison with the attacks of the Tory Democrats who were at no pains to conceal their contempt for the "Goat's" parliamentary abilities, and openly flouted him in the House of Commons;[2] a procedure, which naturally was not pleasing to Northcote who addressed a letter to Mr. John Gorst suggesting that he and his friends return to their places on the Conservative Benches.[3]

While the Earl of Beaconsfield was still alive the Fourth Party insurgents sought his advice. With respect to the party's regularly appointed leadership he gave them to understand that as long as they avoided an open or formal breach they "need not be too particular about" giving their obedience.[4] He remarked that Sir Stafford Northcote represented "the respectability of the party. I wholly sympathize with you all" he added "because I was never respectable myself."[5] Lord Beaconsfield, it might be observed, in his dealings with the Fourth Party gave evidence of his interest and good-will on more occasions than one. Mr. Gorst after a visit to the great man at Hughenden wrote to Lord Randolph Churchill that he had expressed much

[1] See for instance the *Times* (weekly edition), Oct. 26, 1883, p. 10.

[2] The *Times*, May 8, 1884, p. 9.

[3] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 158.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 157.

confidence in their schemes and prophesied "a brilliant future" for them.[1] These intrepid fighters were carrying on a work which in former days Mr. Disraeli himself had been accustomed to perform. The *Daily Telegraph* in commenting on this phase of the situation once expressed the view that if he had not left the House of Commons the Fourth Party would never have been created.[2]

During the first stages of the Fourth Party's insurgency there was no open break with the Conservative chiefs. Despite the violent attacks by Churchill and Gorst a rather good-humored affability obtained in the personal relations between the two groups. The antagonism towards Sir Stafford Northcote had been solely political and by no means personal. His diary during those days contained at least one complimentary reference to Lord Randolph Churchill.[3] The "Old Tories" were inclined to dismiss "this party within a party" as a negligible affair. As a rule the Tory press quite ignored its existence or refused to take it seriously.[4] Lord Salisbury, to be sure, at times seemed to be somewhat worried and puzzled as to the exact object or purpose of this energetic band. But in March, 1883, open warfare broke out and a bitter correspondence was carried on between the two factions. Signs of open hostility became more and more marked. There was much comment, for instance, when Lord Randolph absented himself from the annual dinner of the Conservative Central Committee, on which occasion Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote were speakers.

It was at this juncture of affairs that Lord Randolph

[1] H. Gorst, *The Fourth Party*, p. 148.

[2] *Daily Telegraph*, Jan. 25, 1895, p. 3.

[3] Andrew Lang, *Sir Stafford Northcote* (Edinburgh and London, 1891), vol. ii, p. 159.

[4] *Nineteenth Century*, 1902 (vol. 52), p. 876.

Churchill's letters appeared in the *Times* criticising the party's leadership. Among other things he wrote that if the Conservatives were to place themselves under the control of "third-class statesmen" their days were "in all probability numbered."[1] He further asserted that there were those in the party who did not propose to see their efforts and industry nullified by "bourgeois placemen . . . . honourable tadpoles, and Irish lawyers." In this correspondence as in the Gorst-Wolff manifesto there was a protest against a system which bestowed all the power and honours among the members of an aristocratic clique and "visited with the severest punishment" those who displayed "independence of political thought." These outspoken expressions stirred the friends of Sir Stafford to action. Letters and memorials expressing confidence in his leadership began to appear.[2] There was considerable perturbation in the Tory camp which the *Times* sought to allay by remarking that "Lord Churchill's demonstrations" were "too insignificant to cause serious alarm." The whole affair was attributed to the restlessness of a few young men with ability who felt that they had not received proper recognition.[3] A year later, however, this Tory organ was to realize that the insurgency of Lord Randolph Churchill and his associates was something more than a passing fit of petulance.

The last phase of the Fourth Party's activities consisted in its efforts to democratize and thus vitalize the party machinery. Their object was realized by getting control of the National Union of Conservative Associations. The young Tories were painfully conscious of the weakness and collapse which threatened the whole party organism. Its

[1] The *Times*, Apr. 19, 1883, p. 6.

[2] For example, see the *Times*, Apr. 6, 1883, p. 10, and Apr. 11, 1883, p. 12.

[3] The *Times* (weekly edition), Apr. 6, 1883, p. 10.

deplorable condition was freely commented upon in various quarters. Mr. Labouchere writing in the early part of 1883 considered the Conservatives as a parliamentary party to have ceased.[1] A partial explanation for this state of affairs was the lack of "free communication between the rank and file of the party and their leaders," a defect which Lord Randolph and Mr. Gorst proposed to remedy. The former asserted, as he had done before, that if the Tory party was to continue in power, it must become a "popular party."[2] He realized that if such a consummation was to be achieved it was necessary to democratize the entire Conservative organization. In a speech before the National Union at Birmingham in the early part of 1884, he reminded his hearers that "the great bulk of the Tory party throughout the country" was "composed of artisans and the labouring classes." He then went on to say:

> No party management can be effective and healthy unless the great labouring classes are directly represented on the Executive of the party. I hope before long to see Tory workingmen in Parliament. . . . Now some of our friends in the party have a lesson to learn which they do not seem disposed to learn. The Conservative party will never exercise power until it has gained the confidence of the working-classes and the working-classes are quite determined to govern themselves, and will not be either driven or hoodwinked by any class or class interests. Our interests are perfectly safe if we trust them fully, frankly, and freely, but if we oppose them and endeavour to drive them and hoodwink them, our interests, our Constitution, and all we love and revere will go down. If you want to gain the confidence of the working-classes, let them have a share, and a large share—a real share and not a sham share—in your party councils and in your party government. . . .[3]

[1] *Fortnightly Review*, 1883 (vol. 39), p. 374.

[2] T. H. S. Escott, *op. cit.*, p. 518.

[3] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 309-310.

On this occasion a resolution was adopted which signified that the old methods of party organization and manipulation were "utterly obsolete."

A few months later in addressing the Midland Conservative Club at Birmingham he returned to the same subject. The day had arrived, he said, when the control of party machinery had to be taken out of the hands of the "classes and cliques." He expressed the hope that his audience would not be shocked if he endorsed the caucus methods which Mr. Chamberlain had successfully introduced in the Liberal party and which had played an important part in the election of 1880. He maintained that the Conservatives had lost that election because they had not employed some such popular methods. Lord Beaconsfield, he said, had recognized that fact. He was hopeful that the National Union of Conservative Associations could be made a useful agency for popularizing Tory doctrines. Unfortunately such a plan had not met with entire approval on the part of the Conservative leaders "for there was still a knot of people whose minds dwelt affectionately on the past and who looked back with some longing to the happy days when organization was conducted" on a very exclusive basis. He said that "they regarded with apprehension the popular voice." To popularize the organization should be the aim, he asserted, of every member of the club he was then addressing. Towards the close of his remarks he said that he had been very much impressed by some words which came from the Prime Minister, when, speaking in the House of Commons, he appealed to the Tory members to "trust the people." He then went on to say:

I have long tried to make that my motto; but I know, and will not conceal, that there are still a few in our party who have that lesson yet to learn, and who have yet to understand that the Tory party of today is no longer identified with that

small and narrow class which is connected with the ownership of land, but that its great strength can be found, and must be developed, in our large towns as well as in our country districts. Yes, trust the people. You, who are ambitious, and rightly ambitious, of being the guardians of the British Constitution, trust the people, and they will trust you—and they will follow you and join you in the defense of that Constitution against any and every foe.[1]

At the Annual Conference of Conservatives at Sheffield in July, 1884, he again urged the necessity of adapting the party machinery to modern conditions and of placing Tory principles "on the broadest popular basis."[2]

It was also part of Lord Randolph's plan, not only to secure from the Central Committee more complete recognition for the National Union of Conservative Organizations, but to have ample funds allotted for its work.

In the struggle to secure control of the party machine there ensued between Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote on the one hand and the Fourth Party on the other (excepting Mr. Balfour who on account of his uncle had now withdrawn his support) a contest marked by much acerbity. It was a conflict between Tory Democracy and orthodox Conservatism. It is not necessary to go into the details of the sharp practises to which Lord Randolph frequently resorted. The *Spectator* has a full account of this phase of the conflict and as a champion of the old order it was by no means favourable to Lord Randolph. The opinion was expressed that while he was well fitted for the part of a demagogue his capacity for "political strategy and manoeuvre" was limited. He was berated because he wanted "to see the National Union emulating the Birmingham caucus." His reference to the "disinclination at headquar-

[1] Birmingham *Daily Post*, April 17, 1884, p. 5.

[2] The *Times*, July 14, 1884, p. 10.

ters to sanction such an improvement . . . as the obsolete scruples of men who did not understand their times" was likewise deplored. It was suggested that the Council of which "this ambitious young Tory demagogue" was chairman was "becoming a revolutionary power rather than a staff in the hands of the Conservative leaders." The quarrel which had been

> so injudiciously aired before the public exhibited not merely the extreme difficulty of reconciling aristocratic Conservatism with Tory Democracy, but the special and aggravated difficulty which is encountered by the Conservatives, where the leap into Tory Democracy is advocated by a pert politician with no sense of the gravity of the change, no respect for the traditions of leadership, and no tenderness for the feelings of others.[1]

In the meantime Lord Salisbury, recognizing the strength which Lord Randolph had behind him because of the popular appeal he had made to the rank and file of the party, had come to terms with the "young Tory demagogue." The progressives won a complete victory. In May, 1884, Lord Randolph who had been thrust out of the organization by his enemies was restored as chairman of the Council of the National Union after securing for it the primacy and effectiveness which he had demanded. In the future it was to be established on "a popular and representative basis" instead of the "secret and unrepresentative basis" which had hitherto been the rule.[2]

Following this settlement the outraged *Spectator* printed another leading article questioning the wisdom of Lord Salisbury's action. It prophesied that the advantages would be only temporary because Lord Randolph intended to lead and "not be led." As a proof of his determination to take

[1] The *Spectator*, May 10, 1884, pp. 605-606.

[2] The *Times*, May 8, 1884, p. 9.

his own course and disregard the "bourgeois chiefs" of the party, the *Spectator* referred to his demand that the franchise privileges of the Reform Bill (1884) should be extended to Ireland. That was utterly at variance with Toryism and only served to "reinforce a party . . . . seeking the dismemberment of the Empire and the destruction of property in Ireland. Simply because he was the leader of Tory Democracy." continues this diatribe, "he coolly announced that he had been converted by the debates, pronounced the proposals of the Government to include Ireland 'wise' and just and called upon all good Tories to support it." The situation from the *Spectator's* point of view was quite intolerable. It quoted a statement which had appeared in the *Standard* to the effect that the leaders in allowing Lord Randolph to have his own way were "reducing their army to a mob." Because of the damage he was doing he should be expelled from the party. But on second reflection the writer admitted that this would never do because he would "raise his own banner, declare openly that Toryism must become democratic or die and carry with him probably one-third of the host of heaven. . . . On the other hand," continued the *Spectator,* "if the Tories treated Lord Randolph as another Mr. Disraeli" they would be ruined. This vigorous assailant of Tory Democracy then proceeds to state the issue as follows:

> What is Toryism if Tories are to vote for democratic suffrages, equal distribution, the reign of Parnellites in Ireland, and measures in England conceived in the spirit of Lord Randolph's proposal to expropriate all leasehold houses and vest the freeholds in their occupying tenants? That is American democracy, not Toryism, and if it is Conservative, it is not a Conservatism that members of the Carlton either recognise or care about. They want to be personages, not units; aristocrats, not democrats; privileged people, not men lost in the rushing

crowd which in all but direction is indistinguishable from the swollen Radical mob. They will feel themselves more at home with the Whigs—who do not, at all events, blaspheme the Red book—than with the Tory Democrats. . . . Ultimately as Toryism has its roots deep in human nature, and especially in human nature as developed on this island, they and the Whigs will coalesce and form a powerful party. But intermediately what is to be done? If they, the infinitely respectable old Conservatives, . . . repudiate Lord Randolph, he will upset the coach altogether; while if they follow him, they will sacrifice all that makes life worth living, merely in order to live. Beaconsfield was bad enough, but he had a redeeming love for fine upholstery which kept him fairly straight in the ways of the rich; but this horrid young mutineer has not even that.[1]

It was not long, however, before they were following the "horrid young mutineer." Mr. Chamberlain once remarked in the House of Commons that he paid the greatest attention to everything Lord Randolph Churchill said because he found "that what he says to-day his leaders say tomorrow. They follow him with halting steps, but they always follow him; they may not like the prescription he makes for them, but they always swallow it." [2]

An exhibition of this making virtue of a necessity was seen in an editorial of the *Times,* wherein Lord Randolph was commended in 1884 for the very things which had been considered reprehensible the year before. Although his "propensity to give Toryism" too much democracy was mildly deprecated the *Times* was quite certain that "any party that nowadays aspires to win the confidence of the people, must be popular, responsible and representative." The "fiery spirit," as he was characterized in terms of reproof some months before, was now praised for opposing

[1] The *Spectator,* May 24, 1884, p. 672.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates,* 3rd ser., vol. 286: 851.

the old methods. Because they were obsolete, continues the *Times,* they could not "be expected to secure the confidence of the democracy—whether Tory or Radical." [1] A year later the same publication made a well-considered summary of the transformation which had taken place within the party. Much credit was given to Lord Randolph for his masterful manner in achieving his ends. Although he had shown some inconsistency he was sincere and constant in opposing a policy of negation. He more than anyone else had perceived that if the party was to escape being a "palaeontological museum its adherents must cease to mutter incantations of an earlier time." They would have to adapt themselves to the new order of things and modernize their outlook. Lord Randolph's methods of getting in touch with the workers was highly commended. It was pointed out that by reason of his strength with the masses he must be given prior consideration in the party's councils. "Upon the whole," this editorial goes on to say, "the forward school have effected a very considerable revolution in the Conservative party." Although some of the older Tories had not surrendered their former convictions "a new leaven" had been introduced and the results had exceeded all expectations. The "old country party" which had monopolized the management of affairs would now have to make way for a new force which had "for sometime past been profoundly dissatisfied." These "new men" with their vital progressivism would naturally dominate the Cabinet and the House of Commons and would thrust aside those who had "no other ideas than to adhere to outworn formulas and lifeless traditions." [2]

Through the efforts of Lord Randolph and those of Mr. Gorst who was his faithful ally in capturing and populariz-

[1] The *Times,* May 8, 1884, p. 9.

[2] *Ibid.* (weekly edition), June 19, 1885, p. 11.

ing the National Union, Tory Democracy was in the ascendant. Naturally these two men were jubilant over the outcome. Lord Randolph, while speaking at a Conservative Conference at Bradford in 1886, said: "changes have been accepted which a few years ago would have seemed startling and alarming and a very close union and connexion have been set up by the reform which the Association has undergone, between the masses of the people and the leaders of the party." [1]

The results of this "revolution" as the *Times* called it were manifold. It was apparent in the Tory manifesto which Lord Salisbury issued in 1885 advocating more real local government for Ireland and the enactment of laws which would help solve the land problem. The Local Government Bill of 1888 and the adoption of the Dartford programme by the party leaders bear testimony to the change which had taken place. Mr. Curzon expressed the view that a "more genuine enthusiasm for reform" had developed "in the ranks of the Conservative party than at any previous time during the century." [2] The real fruits of these efforts, however, were to be in evidence after the passing of Lord Randolph Churchill.

The more immediate results consisted in the success which awaited the Conservatives in the elections of 1885 and 1886. When the Gladstone Ministry fell in 1885 and a new election was imminent Lord Randolph was regarded as the most valuable political asset which the party possessed. Mr. Winston Churchill remarks that he was looked upon as "the man of the hour." [3] These high expectations were abundantly justified. The Conservative candidates in those constituencies where Tory Democracy was strongest were uni-

[1] The *Times*, Oct. 27, 1886, p. 6.

[2] *National Review*, 1887 (vol. 8), p. 582

[3] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 377.

formly returned. The strength of the party in the manufacturing towns was particularly noticeable. Mr. Balfour was returned by a Manchester constituency which was largely made up of the working-classes. Lord Randolph in a letter dwelling upon this aspect of the election exclaimed: "Ah—the Whigs can no longer call us the party of the classes. If they do I'll chuck big cities at their heads." [1] A few years later in reviewing the situation as it then existed he observed that the Conservative delegation in the House of Commons "for the first time in its history" was largely made up "of representatives of large and populous centers of the people who are directly in touch with large masses." And this new element, he added, would not tolerate for a moment anything like reaction.[2]

Not only was the general election of 1885 marked by the large number of working-men who turned to Toryism but the influx of young men was likewise notable. Commenting on this circumstance Mr. Curzon said: "No more remarkable phenomenon has been witnessed during the past ten years . . . . than the wholesale and continuous conversion of the younger generation to Conservative views." He observed that fifteen years before the younger men had been flocking to Liberalism. The Conservative party, he added, could no longer be "stigmatized as the creed of the upper classes and the old." [3]

When the Conservative chiefs took Lord Randolph back into favour it was understood that upon the fall of the Gladstone Government he was to be given a high place in the new cabinet.[4] The "secondary position" which the *Spectator* would have grudgingly allowed him a few years be-

[1] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 472.

[2] The *Times*, April 10, 1888, p. 10.

[3] *National Review*, 1887 (vol. 8), p. 582.

[4] The *Times*, Jan. 25, 1895, p. 6.

fore, was no longer considered an adequate recognition for the undoubted services which he had rendered. "The tail of the party" had "triumphed over the head"—a condition of affairs which in 1883 the *Spectator* had described as unthinkable. The "vigorous, brilliant but somewhat wayward politician" was invited by Lord Salisbury to become Secretary of State for India. He stipulated as one of the conditions for his acceptance of that post, the removal of Sir Stafford Northcote to the House of Lords and the designation of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach as leader in the House of Commons. Lord Salisbury reluctantly agreed. Sir Stafford was made Earl of Iddesleigh and the leadership in the lower House was arranged in accordance with Lord Randolph's wishes.[1] Other demands were made including the official recognition of the Primrose League, all of which were duly granted. Lord Salisbury, furthermore, agreed to adopt a programme embracing certain reform measures which Lord Randolph deemed essential. It was this commanding position of the *Spectator's* "young Tory demagogue" which prompted Lord Rosebery to remark that the "Tories were in office but the Radicals in power."

How this new Government was regarded in certain quarters outside of England was indicated by an article appearing in a French newspaper, a copy of which appeared in the weekly edition of the *Times*. The Cabinet arrangement was described as the result of "painful negotiations" which could not "be considered as the triumph of Conservative principles." Lord Salisbury was depicted as having capitulated to Lord Randolph and "a group of young Tories." The writer then went on to say that a "democratic programme" was to be worked out by these "representatives of the aristocracy." Thus the "programme of the Opposition" was to be taken up. The writer observed that such a

[1] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 403.

scheme was nothing new in that it had been tried several times in France, "notably by Napoleon III," but without success. "It is evident," continued this article, "that the old formulae of government and the old parties" are powerless to save England. It was pointed out that both the Liberals and Conservatives had turned towards radicalism. "In order to present a front to her enemies abroad," England "was under the necessity of disarming domestic foes and of giving liberty to the people which she oppressed." [1]

When Lord Randolph became a member of the Salisbury Cabinet in 1885 the Fourth Party came to an end. While a member of the Government in 1885 and 1886 he was largely immersed in administrative duties for which he displayed a marked ability. Although he was not to give as much articulate evidence of his Tory democratic faith he was none the less loyal to its principles. He believed that Tory Democracy, now that the franchise had again been extended, was more essential to the welfare and growth of Conservatism than ever before. At the time, however, Mr. Gorst believed that Lord Randolph in coming to terms with the "old Gang" had deserted the cause and had left him to fight the battle of Tory Democracy alone. This was not the case as subsequent events were to show.

[1] The *Times* (weekly edition), June 26, 1885, p. 3.

CHAPTER IV

Lord Randolph Churchill
(Continued)

The question which was uppermost at the time Lord Randolph Churchill became a member of the Salisbury Ministry had to do with Ireland. Although his attitude towards this matter was often determined by political expediency (for he was always a politician and played the game) his record on the whole was quite consistent with the principles of Tory Democracy. His earliest public utterances as well as his last were in behalf of a more liberal and just treatment of Ireland by the Government at Westminster. In a speech at Woodstock in 1877, as has been already noted, he "laid down such startling principles" on the subject as to provoke remonstrances from the *Morning Post* and from members of his own family.[1] Speaking at Preston in 1880 he denounced the Liberal Government because it had confiscated property, imperiled lives and suspended the liberty of Irish subjects.[2] In one of his early election addresses he demanded a fair treatment of the Irish question including "a judicious reconsideration" of the land laws.[3] He was as a rule opposed to the policy of coercion. According to Mr. Harold Gorst he had a "decided aversion to oppressive measures in dealing with a weaker" people.[4] Lord Ran-

[1] Reginald Lucas, *op. cit.*, p. 293.

[2] The *Times*, Dec. 21, 1880, p. 11.

[3] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 531.

[4] H. Gorst, *The Fourth Party*, p. 190.

dolph often maintained that no party could "hope to govern Ireland or settle the Irish question" by coercion acts. "This," says Mr. Jennings, "was the burden of all his speeches."[1] "We, as Englishmen," he once said, "must remember for the sake of the liberties of our sons and those who come after us that the Constitution of England absolutely prohibits the imposition of exceptional restraints except in time of great disorder."[2] He declared on a later occasion that the mistakes of the Liberals as well as those of the Conservatives had been their policies of coercion.[3] He was pleased, however, to inform a Birmingham audience in 1881 that the Tories had been responsible for fewer repressive measures than their opponents. He asserted that since 1830 his party had passed eleven coercion acts and the Liberals thirty-eight. He further explained that ten of the eleven acts passed by the Tories "were in mitigation or continuance of Liberal" measures.[4]

When Mr. Gladstone's Government introduced the Coercion Bill of 1881 Lord Randolph planned to move an amendment so as to limit its operation for one year. The members of the Fourth Party sought Lord Beaconsfield's advice with respect to this contemplated move, but he did not consider it practicable. Gorst, Balfour and Wolff decided therefore to drop the scheme but Churchill refused to give it up. The incident resulted in so much ill feeling that the Fourth Party ceased to function for two or three months. Finally Lord Randolph agreed with reluctance to abandon his idea.[5] After the Bill was placed on the statute-book, he denounced the Liberals because of the unscrupulous use they made of its

[1] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. ii, p. 332.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 313: 1009.

[3] The *Times*, April 9, 1888, p. 10.

[4] *Speeches*, vol. i, p. 61.

[5] *Nineteenth Century*, 1902 (vol. 52) pp. 1035-1037.

provisions.[1] He criticised particularly the unwarranted increase of the Royal Irish Constabulary and the seizure of *United Ireland* literature.[2] In 1884 he protested against the continuance of certain features of the educational system in Ireland "because it was a source of great grievance and annoyance to the great body of the Catholic population."[3]

Again, in 1885, shortly before the Gladstone Government went out of office, he spoke vigorously against the folly and futility of antagonizing the Irish. During an address before the St. Stephens Club in May of that year he reminded his hearers that Parliament had just enfranchised over half a million people in Ireland. In a few months, he said, they would be exercising their recently acquired franchise privileges. He pictured the state of mind which these voters would have when they went to the polls, in the event of the Liberals passing a new coercion measure. Instead of the English Government giving them a "kick" it would have been the part of wisdom "to have put some kind thoughts into their minds towards England" by abrogating "all that harsh legislation which . . . . insults the dignity of a sensitive and an imaginative race." Such an act as that which was proposed, easily explained, he said, why the masses of the voters readily responded to the appeals of Mr. Parnell and believed him when he said Ireland would never be prosperous and happy until freed from English rule.[4]

When the Gladstone Government was followed by that of Lord Salisbury's in June, 1885, Lord Randolph continued the same policy which he had displayed as a member of the Opposition. One incident which afforded him the opportunity to exhibit his sympathy with the Irish point of view

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 266: 532.

[2] *Ibid.*, 439: 440.

[3] *Ibid.*, 291: 1856-1857.

[4] The *Times* (weekly edition), May 22, 1885, pp. 761-762.

had to do with the Maamtrasna affair. As the result of a brutal murder in Maamtrasna in 1882 three men were executed and five were sentenced to penal servitude for life. There was good reason to believe that the verdicts which had been rendered, were, in at least one of the cases, unjust and that a judicial wrong had been perpetrated. When the Conservatives came into power in 1885 Mr. Parnell moved a resolution reflecting on Lord Spencer, the Viceroy of Ireland, and demanding an inquiry into the charges of injustice which had been made. During the debates which followed Lord Randolph voted with the Irish Nationalists to the great vexation of the old Tories. The *Spectator* charged him with "cynical recklessness" for the part he played in this affair.[1]

Another instance of his good faith towards Ireland consisted in submitting to Lord Salisbury a plan which provided for popular government in Ireland, on the same basis as that obtaining in England. He also suggested concessions to the Catholics with respect to education. This exhibition of good will was the occasion of the following comment by Mr. Chamberlain during the course of a speech at Halloway in 1885: "Lord Randolph," he said, "does not believe and neither do I believe in a policy of perpetual repression and he favours as I favour the concession of local government to Ireland—a system under which Irishmen shall have some effective control of their own affairs." [2]

What was Lord Randolph Churchill's attitude towards Home Rule? Numerous quotations could be cited from his public utterances which show that he was as unalterably opposed to such a solution of the problem as Mr. Chamberlain or any of the Unionists. His position was quite in keeping with the Disraelian formula of maintaining the institutions of the country and preserving the Empire. He

[1] The *Spectator*, Oct. 2, 1886, p. 1298.

[2] *Mr. Chamberlain's Speeches*, edited by H. W. Lucy, pp. 152-153.

would do everything possible in granting concessions, in pursuing a conciliatory policy and in passing the fullest measure of helpful, just and generous legislation. He believed in developing the "national resources of Ireland" by liberal grants of money on the easiest terms for railways, canals, roads, labourers' dwellings, fisheries and other objects which would improve the economic condition of the people. In advocating these measures, he contended that the English owed "the Irish a great deal for" their "bad government of them in the past." But he would not tolerate for a moment the idea of a separate Parliament in Dublin. At least this is the conclusion forced on one after reading his addresses on the subject. For instance, in a speech at Edinburgh in 1883 he spoke as follows:

> If you value your life as an Empire . . . let the Irish know in the most unmistakable manner, that though they cry unto you in the night and day, though they vex you with much wickedness and harass you with much disorder, though they cost you all manner of trial and trouble . . . there is one thing you will detect at once in whatever form or guise it may be presented to you, there is one thing you will never listen to, there is one thing you will never yield, that is their demand for an Irish Parliament.[1]

Three years later he pronounced Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill "a farrago of superlative nonsense," and on another occasion he maintained that such an arrangement would be "utterly unmanageable and impracticable."[2] He once characterized the Nationalist movement as a struggle between the Government of the Queen "and the forces of treason and sedition and anarchy in Ireland."[3] As late as

[1] The *Scotsman*, Dec. 21, 1883, p. 6.

[2] *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches*, vol. ii, p. 137.

[3] The *Times* (weekly edition), April 8, 1887, p. 7.

1889 he was just as strongly opposed to anything looking like a separatist movement. Speaking in Birmingham he pleaded earnestly for a more generous and a more just treatment of the Irish question. He advocated a greater degree of popular local government and an equitable settlement of the land problem. But, he went on to say, "so far as its supreme Executive Government" was concerned, it was absolutely essential and imperative that Ireland should continue to remain under the control of the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. He hoped that he would "never live to see the day when there may be established in Ireland a separate Parliament and a separate Government."[1] According to the *Morning Post* he always maintained that any arrangement which would result in the Loyalists of Ireland being handed over "to the domination of an Assembly"—which in the nature of things would be a "foreign and alien Assembly"—would be unworthy of the traditions of the British nation.[2]

These statements seem to be absolute, final and without equivocation. But if we can believe Mr. Wilfrid Scawen Blunt they did not represent Lord Randolph's real convictions. Mr. Blunt makes the assertion that there was "none of that strong prepossession in his mind against Home Rule" which, he says, was commonly attributed to him. He had, according to this authority, "secret Home Rule leanings." In an article which Blunt wrote for the *Nineteenth Century* he relates that his journal of the 7th of May 1885, recounts the following:

Randolph, when I saw him, talked over the matter of my going to Parliament. I told him of my conversation with Parnell and showed him the paper I drew up a little while ago,

[1] The *Times*, July 31, 1889, p. 10.

[2] *Morning Post*, Jan. 25, 1895, p. 6.

headed—"Am I a Tory Democrat?" of which he approved as a possible basis of my joining the party, though he said of course, he did not pledge himself to go with me on all points. He objected a little to my using the word "Home Rule." "I know, of course," he said, "it must come to this: but we haven't educated the party up to it yet and it would be better to use some vaguer expression." [1]

When Mr. Blunt adds the information that the Home Rule plan contained in his memorandum, was to be of the widest kind, comparable to that of Hungary, the reader is at a loss to account for Lord Randolph's vagaries. The perplexity is not lessened when Sir Algernon West relates that in a conversation with Lord Randolph the latter observed that "it was foolish to throw obstacles in the way of the Home Rule Bill being brought forward." [2]

It is quite possible that Mr. T. P. O'Connor was cognizant of this inner state of Lord Randolph's mind. While speaking in the House of Commons on the Government of Ireland Bill in June 1886 he made the following allusion. He said that he knew

quite well that some of the friends of the noble Lord the member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) are a great deal more consistent than the noble Lord. Mr. Wilfrid Blunt is a friend of the noble Lord. . . . If Mr. Wilfrid Blunt gave me permission which no person but Mr. Blunt can give or withhold, I think I could say something that would startle the House. Mr. Wilfrid Blunt was a Conservative Home Ruler, and he is a Home Ruler still, and his consistency is the more admirable because of the example set in other quarters.

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, 1906 (vol. 59), p. 407.

Mr. Gretton quoting the *Times* of 7 July 1886 calls attention to the fact that Mr. Gladstone once remarked "that the Conservatives had not been far from a Home Rule Bill of their own." R. H. Gretton, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 184.

[2] Sir Algernon West, *Private Diaries*, p. 136.

Taking his cue from an interruption by Mr. Parnell at this point he continued: "Yes—as my honourable friend the member for Cork reminds me, we should have, in addition to Mr. Blunt, to obtain the permission of Conservatives a good deal higher than he." [1]

Whatever may have been Lord Randolph's real feelings on the subject of Home Rule he constantly urged that the Government should do all in its power to effect and cement a real union by wise and generous legislation. He would remove all legitimate grievances and thus have a friendly as well as a legal union. As for maintaining the Union, he told the members on his side of the House that the best way to accomplish it was to identify the Conservative party "with good government, with efficient administration and with wise and progressive legislation." [2] The problem would be largely solved, he assured his party a few years later, if they would give to the Irish the same liberties which they gave to the English.[3] That was his message in 1886 when, speaking in favour of the Municipal Franchise Bill, he declared "that a safe means of maintaining the Union in the Countries" was the granting of the same laws and privileges in both of them." [4] Referring to Ireland on another occasion he remarked that "the great sign-posts of policy in the development of a genuine popular system of government in all the countries of the United Kingdom were equality, similarity and simultaneity." [5]

Largely as a result of the policy of conciliation urged by Lord Randolph the Nationalists gave the Salisbury Government of 1885 their support. Without the assistance of the

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 306: 882.

[2] *Ibid.*, 310: 288.

[3] *Ibid.*, 325: 510.

[4] *Ibid.*, 305: 331.

[5] Alexander Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

Parnellite votes the Conservatives would have been in a minority. When the Irish support was withdrawn in the following January the Salisbury Ministry had to resign. This defection was due to the Government's decision to introduce coercion legislation, a move which Lord Randolph naturally deplored.[1] Mr. Gladstone returned to power and immediately put forth his plans for Home Rule.

At this juncture of affairs Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Hartington and other Liberal Unionists entered into an alliance with the Conservatives. For this arrangement, according to some accounts, Lord Randolph Churchill was largely responsible. That, at least, is the opinion of his son and biographer.[2] The *Times* has an account of Lord Randolph making an appeal at the time for a new political party which was to take the name of "Unionist."[3] "Let us go in for a party of Union," he exclaimed in a speech at Manchester in the early part of May, 1886. Continuing, he said: "It is not only to be a party of Union of the United Kingdom but it is also to be a party which supports as its . . . . principle, union with our colonies and union with our Empire." In another part of the speech he asked:

> Do you not think that such a party might be formed which might combine all that is best of the politics of the Tory, the Whig or the Liberal? . . . and might we not call that party by a new name—might we not call it the party of the Union? Members of that party might be known as Unionists.[4]

[1] *Edinburgh Review*, 1906 (vol. 204), p. 23. But after the step had been taken Lord Randolph tried to justify the move. See his speech at Paddington, 13 Feb. 1886. *Speeches*, vol. ii, pp. 89-90.

[2] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 77.

[3] The *Times* (weekly edition), Mar. 5, 1886, p. 4.

[4] *Ibid.* Mr. Disraeli in an election address in 1832 made a somewhat similar proposal. "Rid yourselves," so goes the manifesto, "of all the political jargon of factious slang of Whig and Tory and unite in forming a great national party." H. W. Lucy, *Memories of Eight Parliaments*. See also *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches*, vol. ii, p. 23.

While Lord Randolph was not likely to have appealed to men like Lord Hartington, he did have much influence, however, in directing Mr. Chamberlain's steps towards the Conservative ranks. They had much in common. Lord Randolph was the champion of radical doctrines in the Conservative party and Mr. Chamberlain in that of the Liberal camp. As Mr. Winston Churchill remarks, they "both were popular leaders drawing their strength from democracy." [1] Viscount Morley has likewise called attention to the same resemblance. "The radical programme of Mr. Chamberlain," he has observed, "was matched by the Tory Democracy of Lord Randolph Churchill." [2]

Mr. Chamberlain, although he did not formally identify himself with the Conservative party until 1895, was a source of much strength and encouragement to the Tory democratic forces during the decade preceding that date. According to the parliamentary correspondent of the *Times* his support was a considerable factor in making the Conservatives adopt a policy "of advanced social reform." [3] A like opinion was voiced in a leading article in the *Morning Post*. Mr. Churchill [4] and Mr. Salmon [5] have expressed the belief that he was a considerable asset to Tory Democracy. "He was a great Tory Democrat," wrote Mr. F. E. Smith (now Lord Birkenhead) in his volume entitled *Unionist Policy*.[6] An editorial in the *Times* would have us believe that he was more of a Tory Democrat than Lord Randolph himself. The writer agreed with Lord Rosebery in saying that Lord

[1] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. xi, p. 76.

[2] John Morley, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 201.

[3] Herbert Sidebotham, *Political Profiles* (Boston and New York, 1921), p. 129.

[4] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. xi, p. 287.

[5] *National Review*, 1891 (vol. 17), p. 268.

[6] F. E. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

Randolph was a Radical in the wrong camp. As for Mr. Chamberlain the contention was made that "he always had something of the Tory spirit because he always looked . . . . to the institutions of his city, of his country or of the Empire" as the means for affecting his social reforms "rather than to abstract ideas." [1]

Mr. Chamberlain himself at different times explained and justified his change of party affiliation on other grounds than that of "Unionism." In a speech at Birmingham in 1887 he spoke of the likelihood of forming "some new combination no less anxious for progressive reforms upon all social and political subjects. . . . We shall be taunted," he went on to say, "with alliance with the Tories . . . . but I look beyond mere party designation. They offer us," he continued, "a programme which two years ago a Liberal would have accepted with enthusiasm." [2] Speaking at Greenwich in 1889 he again referred to the taunts thrown at him and his Unionist friends for "having joined the Tories." He then spoke of the meager support accorded him by his former Liberal associates when he put forward his "unauthorized programme," in which he advocated popular local government, free education, allotment of small holdings for labourers and graduated taxation.

He by no means implied that all the Tories were favourable to advanced legislation. He reminded his hearers that he had been denounced "as a leveller and an anarchist" by some of them. But the Tory Government as then constituted had enacted legislation which, he declared, embodied most of the reforms which he had long but unsuccessfully sought during his sojourn in the Liberal camp. He contended that this was sufficient proof that he had not sacrificed his convictions in changing his party connection. He

[1] The *Times*, Feb. 9, 1907, p. 11.

[2] *Fortnightly Review*, 1887 (vol. 48), pp. 145-146.

said that "the result of the alliance . . . . was good for the country not only because it prevented the monstrous . . . . Home Rule" scheme, but also, in that it secured "practical and important reforms which would have been thrown altogether into the back-ground" if the country had been solely engrossed in consideration of the Irish question, which was quite likely to happen if Mr. Gladstone had secured control of affairs.[1]

That the Tories were more favourable to social reform than the Liberals was a frequent assertion of Mr. Chamberlain. He once made the statement that when he belonged to the "Radical party so-called" he was accustomed to assert that reform legislation from the time of the first factory laws down to the Compensation for Accidents Bill was "due to the constructive capacity" of Tory Governments.[2] In 1892 he said that while "a small section of the Tory party" disliked "progressive Conservatism, the big majority favoured it. The fact is," he continued, "that in social questions the Tories have almost always been more progressive than the Liberals."[3] At the time he transferred his party allegiance he was impressed with the liberalizing influence which was being exerted by Lord Randolph within the Conservative organization. In June, 1887, when speaking before the Liberal Union he referred to the passing of the older Toryism in these words: "The Dartford speech of Lord Randolph Churchill made at a time when he was a prominent member of the Government and confirmed by several subsequent speeches of his colleagues sounded the death knell of the old reactionary Tory policy."

What Lord Randolph thought of the attitude of Mr

[1] The *Times* (weekly edition), Aug. 2, 1889, p. 8.

[2] Alexander Mackintosh, *Joseph Chamberlain*, p. 373.

[3] *Annual Register*, 1892, p. 154.

Chamberlain was indicated in the course of an address at Trowbridge in the summer of 1887 when he asserted that this former Radical "had discovered what he believed the great mass of the people discovered long ago, that there was within the Tory party a great fund of popular sympathy with the wishes of the people . . . . and that no class prejudice, no fossil influence of any sort or kind would be allowed" to disregard the demands of the rank and file. He added that Mr. Chamberlain's political ideas were worthy of high commendation and that there was nothing in his policy "which should cause any sharp or dividing differences of opinion." [1]

As to how long Mr. Chamberlain continued to be a Tory Democrat, granting that he ever was one, is a debatable question. His radicalism after he became a Unionist was less pronounced as time went on. At this stage of his career he was considered quite moderate and harmless by the privileged classes. His progressivism was looked upon as belonging to the "middle-class" sort. According to Mr. Gretton "it was taken, so to speak, as a homeopathic dose against Lord Randolph Churchill." [2] Although one admirer insists that he was from first to last a great reformer [3] and he himself said that "he still held the radical opinion of his early days" after becoming a Unionist,[4] it is the consensus of opinion that after 1895 he became mainly identified with the cause of Empire and lost his zeal for social reform. "He began as an extreme Radical and even almost Republican: he became an extreme Tory and an op-

[1] *Fortnightly Review*, 1887 (vol. 48), p. 147.

[2] R. H. Gretton, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 363.

[3] *Mr. Chamberlain's Speeches* (intro.), vol. i, p. x.

[4] A Composite *Life of Mr. Chamberlain*, by Viscount Milner and others, p. 116.

ponent of every popular movement," is the opinion expressed by Mr. Justin McCarthy.[1]

Resuming a consideration of the events which attended the support Mr. Chamberlain and his associates brought to the Conservative party, it is to be noted that Lord Salisbury upon assuming office in 1886 requested Lord Randolph Churchill to become the Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the Government forces in the House of Commons. He accepted and soon was striving to realize, through legislative acts, the Tory Democracy which he had advocated while a private member. A notable instance of his consistency was the programme which he outlined and advocated in his famous Dartford speech in October, 1886. This was the first public utterance he made after assuming his new responsibilities and forms a landmark in his career as well as that of the Conservative party and Tory Democracy. On that occasion, according to the *Times,* he "announced a policy of reform so comprehensive and progressive as to take the old Tories' breath away."[2]

The Dartford speech dealt with elementary education, local government, land legislation and other needed reforms.[3] He promised that a bill would be passed by the Government providing "facilities through the operation of local authorities for the acquisition by the agricultural labourer of freehold plots and allotments of land." He held out the hope of a change in the law of tithe so that payment in the first instance would be made by the landlord.[4] Retrenchment and reform "of public expenditures and consequent reduc-

[1] The *Independent,* Feb. 8, 1906, p. 312.

[2] The *Times* (weekly edition), December 31, 1886, p. 12.

[3] For a full account of this speech see the *Times,* October 4, 1886, p. 10. Also *Churchill's Speeches,* vol. ii, pp. 68-86, contains most of the pronouncement.

[4] The *Spectator* commented unfavourably on this proposal. The *Spectator,* 1886, p. 1332.

tion of taxation" constituted an essential part of the Dartford programme. Lord Randolph spoke briefly but strongly on this subject. He promised to devote "whatever energy or strength or influence" he possessed in an effort to inaugurate greater efficiency and economy in spending the people's money. "I shall be bitterly disappointed," he declared, "if it is not in my power after one year or at any rate two years to show to the public that a very honest and a very earnest effort has been made in that direction and that that effort has been attended with practical and sensible results." Before three months were over he was to prove that this was no empty phrase.

The great question which he said "overshadowed all others" was the establishment of a genuinely popular form of local government. He assured his hearers that it was "the decided intention of the Government to take it up in earnest and arrive at a settlement of it." The matter of local government, he said, was involved with that of licensing. He declared further that it was imperative to provide for popular local government in Ireland. He spoke also of a commission which was investigating the feasibility of granting public credit for the development of public works in Ireland. He hoped that great things would result from this undertaking and that it would help to develop the natural resources of that country.

He promised that popular elementary education which was so universally demanded would receive legislative attention as soon as the Royal Commission examining the subject had made its report. He intimated that the Government would direct its attention to the question of railway rates which he said was "of enormous interest to the agriculturist community." Reform of procedure in the House of Commons was included in the Dartford programme, closure by a bare majority being advocated. As the *Annual Reg-*

ister pointed out, this was scarcely a democratic idea and came with poor grace from one whose previous record as an obstructionist was still fresh in the mind of the public.[1]

With respect to foreign affairs Lord Randolph expressed himself in favour of a policy which would make Europe safe for democracy. Referring to the situation in Serbia and Roumania he declared that "the sympathies of England with liberty and independence of communities and nationalities is of ancient origin and has become the traditional direction of our policy." If the Government of the Queen should be disposed to interfere in foreign affairs there could be no doubt that such interference would be favourable to those who sought "the peace of Europe and the liberties of peoples." [2]

This pronouncement from an important member of the Ministry disturbed the extreme Tories and the Radicals alike. The Radicals were disquieted because Lord Randolph had appropriated some of their favourite policies as he himself admitted in a subsequent speech.[3] In fact the *Standard* thought he had quite gone beyond the bounds of Liberalism, remarking that he had indulged in expressions on this and other occasions "which even an earnest Liberal would think extreme."[4] As for the reactionaries in his own party they were more perturbed than ever over the proposals of the new Chancellor of the Exchequer who in their estimation was unsafe and lacking in political honesty.[5] According to Lord Rosebery the Dartford speech alarmed them.[6]

[1] *Annual Register*, 1886, p. 285.

[2] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. ii, pp. 84-85.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 92-93.

[4] The *Standard*, Dec. 31, 1886, p. 5.

[5] The *Spectator*, Oct. 2, 1886, p. 1297.

[6] Lord Rosebery, *Lord Randolph Churchill*, p. 151.

Although he met with much resistance the Government finally sanctioned in a formal manner his programme. How reluctantly this sanction was granted by some of his associates in the Cabinet may be readily imagined. For the purpose of strengthening his position and of making more certain the eventual success of his schemes he assured his audience at Dartford that he "spoke with the full knowledge and assent of his colleagues in the Cabinet" which fact was later corroborated by Mr. W. H. Smith, the Secretary of State for War.[1] On October 23rd, some three weeks after his appearance at Dartford, Lord Randolph spoke in Bradford at the annual meeting of the Conservative Associations, on which occasion he took cognizance of the attacks which had been directed against his recent pronouncement by certain sections of the press. He triumphantly vindicated his position and for the time being silenced his critics.[2]

It soon became evident to Lord Randolph that the Government did not intend to carry out honestly and energetically the policies which they had promised to support. Consequently he addressed a vigorous letter of protest to Lord Salisbury expressing discouragement over the fact that "the Dartford programme was crumbling into pieces every day." The Tories, he complained, simply lacked capacity to make laws of a democratic mould. "They can govern," he wrote, "and make war and increase taxation *à marveille* but legislation is not their province in a democratic constitution." In conclusion he stated that he did not have "the courage and energy to go on struggling against cliques as poor Dizzy did all his life." The reply which he received to his communication did not bring him much encouragement. Lord Salisbury dwelt upon the conflicting interests in the party which must always be considered. He said that it was

[1] The *Times*, Oct. 30, 1886, p. 6.

[2] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. ii, p. 87.

made up of both classes and masses and it was difficult to make them work together. He explained the necessity of Conservative legislation being "tentative and cautious, not sweeping and dramatic."

The alternative to such a policy, he wrote, was to trust to "public meetings and the democratic forces" and pass drastic measures which would hit the classes. Such a procedure, he assured Lord Randolph, would result in failure. With shrewd political wisdom the Conservative Prime Minister advised Lord Randolph that the classes would not oppose the measures which were prejudicial to their interests but would wait for some issue which would enable them to appeal to popular feeling or one regarding which the masses might be indifferent. "Your role," he concluded, "should be rather that of a diplomatist trying to bring the opposed sections of the party together, and not that of a whip trying to keep the slugs up to the collar."[1] This correspondence shows how incompatible were the principles of these two Conservative leaders. Consequently it is not surprising that Lord Randolph shortly tendered his resignation, which was duly accepted.

More has been written with respect to Lord Randolph's abrupt action in leaving the Salisbury Ministry than to any other single incident in his career. In fact the entire controversy in regard to his character and political principles revolves about that event. A score of reasons have been advanced for this move which at the time created a political sensation. His son thinks "it would be a barren task to set forth the motives of this act in a schedule. Yet the main causes," he says, "emerge—shadowy perhaps, but unmistakable." Devotion to Tory Democracy was a factor, in the opinion of his biographer, who goes on to say:

[1] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 224-225.

Lord Randolph Churchill did not think of himself as a man, but rather as the responsible trustee and agent of the Tory Democracy; and this temper overpowering even the most attractive personal associations impelled him by deliberate steps—yet not without deep despondency—towards a fateful issue.[1]

Mr. Churchill seems to think that the resignation was inevitable—that it was part of the struggle between the new and the old, between the progressive and the reactionary, between Tory Democracy and the older Toryism. Lord Randolph, because of his progressivism, was not in harmony with his colleagues. He was too advanced in his political and economic outlook. He would not—in fact could not—accommodate his pace to their gradual and too slow progress towards the new order. As for working in the same cabinet with Lord Salisbury—it was impossible. "The gulf," writes Mr. Churchill,

> which separated the fiery leader of Tory Democracy—with his bold plans of reform and dreams of change . . . from the old-fashioned Conservative statesman, the head of a High Church and High Tory family . . . was a gulf no mutual needs, no common interests, no personal likings could permanently bridge. They represented conflicting schools of political philosophy. They stood for ideas mutually incompatible. Sooner or later the breach must come and no doubt the strong realization of this underlay the action of the one and the acquiescence of the other.[2]

Lord Randolph would not compromise, so he resigned. To have worked with the Salisbury Government would have meant "political paralysis for years" is the opinion which is set forth in his biography.[3] Mr. John Morley once ex-

[1] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 248-249.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 241.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

pressed the view that the resignation meant political suicide. Lord Randolph seems to have preferred the latter alternative.

The *Times* has also suggested the futility of any effort to "exercise a liberalizing influence over the deliberations of the Cabinet" because of Lord Salisbury's lack of sympathy with the newer ideas.[1] "I fondly hoped to make the Conservative party the instrument of Tory Democracy," Lord Randolph remarked at the time of his resignation. "It was an idle schoolboy's dream," he added.[2] In a letter to Lord Dunraven he wrote with just a suggestion of regret and bitterness, as follows:

> Tory Democracy might be a bad name but it represents to you and me and many more, distinct political principles which you and I hold very strongly. That those principles are in the utmost danger just now there can be no doubt. We know what Lord Salisbury is and we know what Goschen is and we know that our views are regarded by both with unrelenting distrust and aversion.[3]

Similar sentiments were expressed in his correspondence with another Tory Democrat, the Honourable Lionel Holland. He wrote that he had advocated since 1880 "a generally liberal and progressive policy." But when he became Chancellor of the Exchequer he realized that his colleagues were not prepared to support those policies and consequently promises which had been made to the public were to be ignored or evaded.[4] The reactionaries were too strongly entrenched. In a communication to Mr. Chamberlain at this juncture of affairs he lamented that the Government's "innate Toryism" was "rampant and irrepressible."[5]

[1] The *Times* (weekly edition), Dec. 24, 1886, p. 10.

[2] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 280.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 275.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 458.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 262.

Not all accounts agree, however, that the motives that impelled Lord Randolph's resignation were dictated by the generous devotion to high principles which the foregoing correspondence would suggest. Mr. S. H. Jeyes in his *Life and Times of the Marquis of Salisbury* asserts that the real explanation of Lord Randolph's resignation was his failure to "make himself master of the Salisbury Cabinet." [1] "Restless ambition" and the discovery that he could not force the hand of Lord Salisbury was the explanation given by the *Times* some years later.[2] The *Standard* thought he wanted to be a dictator, failing in which he withdrew in a mood of petulance.[3] There were many who believed that his withdrawal was due solely to personal ambition; that he was playing the game; that because of his unprecedented rise he had overestimated his importance and when his enemies had the chance they gladly cast him aside. But Lord Randolph Churchill denied these assertions. "They say I had resigned from motives of personal ambition," he exclaimed in a speech to his Paddington constituents. "Why, gentlemen," he went on to say, "if I had consulted motives of personal ambition I had only to stay where I was. I had so high a position that I could desire nothing more. The mere fact of the position I occupied is an answer to the idiotic accusation that I resigned office from motives of personal ambition." [4] Not the holding of high office but adherence to principle guided his actions, if a letter to one of his political friends is to be trusted. "You are quite right," he wrote, "in supposing that mere returning to office has never been in my mind. I fight for a policy and not

[1] S. H. Jeyes, *Life and Times of the Marquis of Salisbury* (London, 1895-1896), vol. iv, p. 145.

[2] The *Times*, Feb. 8, 1907, p. 4.

[3] The *Standard*, Dec. 24, 1886, p. 5.

[4] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. ii, p. 132.

for place." [1] His filial biographer has pointed ont, that if he was seeking personal aggrandizement he had selected an unfortunate time and not the best occasion with which to make political capital. As a skilful politician he must have known quite clearly that he had chosen his ground badly in a fight which was to serve personal ends. Mr. Churchill looks upon his father's resignation in the light of a personal sacrifice. He asserts that Lord Randolph regarded "this action as the most exalted of his life." [2] In a letter to Lord Justice FitzGibbons three days after he resigned he wrote as follows: "In inflicting this final fatal blow I have mortally wounded myself. But the work is practically done: the Tory party will be turned into a Liberal party and in that transformation may yet produce a powerful governing force." [3] Justin McCarthy, who may be regarded as an unprejudiced observer, said that Lord Randolph "passed out of public life an honest and honourable martyr to his strong convictions." [4]

The opinion has been advanced that Lord Randolph, in resigning, confidently expected to be invited back on his own terms. This happened when he withdrew as Chairman of the Central Union of Conservative Associations, on which occasion he refused to assume his former position unless his policies were adopted.[5] In the event of his returning to the Salisbury Cabinet he would have been able to demand, as

[1] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 307. It is difficult to resist the impression that in this letter Lord Randolph was making a virtue of necessity. His involuntary exclamation that "Salisbury was a fool to let me go so easily" lends colour to such a conclusion. Mr. Morley has described the whole affair as a miscalculation. John Morley, *op. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 363.

[2] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 249.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

[4] Justin McCarthy, *op. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 204.

[5] *Saturday Review*, Jan. 26, 1895, p. 116.

the price of his future services, the adoption of his Tory democratic programme. Mr. Chamberlain seemed to have thought this a likely arrangement. In a letter written three days after the resignation he assured Lord Randolph that "in their hearts" they knew he was indispensable and that when they realized they could not "bully" him they would come to his "terms." [1] But he was not indispensable [2] and he was not called back on his own "terms." He had "overlooked Goschen." [3]

Some of Lord Randolph's friends contended that he would have best served the cause of Tory Democracy by exercising a little more patience and continuing in office. Mr. Labouchere, the Radical M. P., wrote him a letter urging such a course. His mother gave him similar advice from time to time. He took cognizance of this argument and replied that his reform programme had been hastened by the very fact of his resigning. He maintained that this extraordinary move had so aroused the country that the Government had been stirred to action. Unless his protest had assumed the unusual form it did his reform proposals would have remained unheeded. That, at least, is the explanation he set forth to his constituents at Paddington. "My resignation of office," he declared, "made the realization of the Dartford programme more certain and the Dartford programme is more likely to be carried into effect now than it was when I resigned office." [4] He put forth the same claim a little later in a speech at Preston. He then said that the Government were ploughing with his oxen. "I find that the Dartford programme is being steadily but unmistakably carried out," he declared.[5] With respect to the Govern-

[1] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 253.

[2] A. S. T. Griffith—Boscawen, *Fourteen Years in Parliament*, p. 5.

[3] *Annual Register*, 1887, p. 2.

[4] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. ii, p. 140.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 350.

ment's foreign policy he was able to say in the Paddington speech that it had "been profoundly and beneficially modified" since his resignation.[1]

At the time speculation was rife as to the specific cause of Lord Randolph's abrupt decision to break off relations with the Salisbury Government. The *Saturday Review* expressed the opinion that differences respecting the Local Government Bill was the occasion of the rupture.[2] The *Times* thought that it was due to his insistence on having the Government "give Ireland partial satisfaction."[3] The *Spectator* like the *Saturday Review* said that he desired a more liberal Local Government Bill than Lord Salisbury was disposed to grant.[4] The following quotation from Lord Randolph's letter of resignation confirms these conclusions. "The character of the domestic legislation," he wrote, "which the Government contemplate, in my opinion falls sadly short of what the Parliament and the country expect and require."[5]

The immediate and ostensible reason assigned for this step by Lord Randolph was the rejection of his economy budget by Lord Salisbury's Cabinet. As he fully explained in a speech in the House of Commons he had made pledges throughout the country to inaugurate a policy of retrenchment and reform.[6] At Dartford only a few months before he had promised that efforts would be made to reduce the expenses of the Government and he was determined to abide by the obligations which he had then assumed in the name

[1] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill,* vol. ii, p. 140.

[2] *Saturday Review,* Jan. 1, 1887, p. 3.

[3] The *Times* (weekly edition), Dec. 31, 1886, p. 6.

[4] The *Spectator,* Dec. 25, 1886, p. 1723.

[5] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 240.

[6] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill,* vol. ii, p. 105.

of his party. He stated in his letter of resignation that he was "pledged up to the eyes to large reductions of expenditures" and that he was under obligation to live up to that commitment.[1] Speaking in Parliament at a later date he again asserted that his promises to the people respecting retrenchment and the discovery that these promises would not be carried out left him no alternative other than that of withdrawing from the Ministry.[2] He did not propose to go up and down the country and make campaign speeches pledging reforms and winning votes for the party only to have himself and his pledges dishonoured. He remarked on one occasion that the members of his party had no objection to his "winning applause at great mass meetings" but when he attempted "to carry . . . . to a practical conclusion" the policies set forth at these gatherings there was not the same degree of approbation.[3] In a speech at Preston in 1888 while referring to the enemies he had made in his own party, he explained that his principal offense had been the uncompromising position he had taken with respect to carrying out the party's promise. "I had only insisted, as I shall always insist," he asserted, "on a literal performance of pledges given by the Unionist party to the people of this country."[4]

It has always been a mooted question as to just how far a person in office is obligated by the pledges made to his constituents and to the country at large. Edmund Burke had one view. Lord Randolph Churchill seems to have had another. In certain parts of the United States the matter is settled by introducing the "recall." Lord Randolph de-

[1] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 235.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 310: 66.

[3] *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches*, vol. ii, p. 336.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 349.

cided to apply that principle to his own case. As soon as it became obvious that it would be impossible to carry out his pledges and what he believed to be the mandate of the people he voluntarily resigned. If this, then, was the motive which to any considerable extent entered into his determination to retire, as he insisted it did, he gave an admirable exhibition of his belief in a government of the people and by the people. There was something of the spirit of Andrew Jackson in an utterance of his during this crisis, in which he declared that he looked to the people for his authority and power rather than to the officialdom of the Treasury Bench. Speaking in the House of Commons on the subject of his resignation he said:

> Any little political influence which I may possess—any little political strength which may have been given to me—has not hitherto been drawn from within the walls of this House, or from within that circle whose centre is the Treasury Bench. No, Sir! it has come from outside, and I appeal on this question to Caesar—to the just and generous judgment of the people. I have only desired to promote their most material interests, and on this great question of economy and retrenchment I patiently wait for the judgment of the people.[1]

Lord Randolph Churchill, furthermore, felt obligated to follow a policy of economy not only because he had made promises to that effect but because it was in accord with the policy of Tory Democracy. In his Paddington speech he declared that the work of economy and public retrenchment constituted the "great keystone" of the policy of Sir Robert Peel[2] whom he believed to have been "the greatest Tory Minister" the century had produced and who "adopted all the principles and ideas of what people call Tory Demo-

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 310: 299.

[2] *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches*, vol. ii, p. 133.

cracy." [1] He added that as Chancellor of the Exchequer it was his particular business to see to it that he did not spend one shilling of the people's money which was not required by "the public service." [2]

His proposed economies were to be effected through the reduction of army and naval expenditures. He explained in the Paddington speech that the sums spent by these two departments and the manner of their spending could be likened to the wasteful and incompetent methods used in Russia.[3] At a later date he characterized the conditions which existed in the War Office and the Admiralty as "rotten and profligate." [4] He declared that his resignation served to turn "the full glare of public opinion on those two great spending departments." [5] Nor was his demand for economy a passing mood. That he had a genuine conviction on the subject is the general consensus of opinion.[6] He had frequently denounced the Liberals because they had failed to live up to their favourite formula of "peace, retrenchment and reform." Such a criticism for instance found expression in a speech at Sheffield in 1885.[7] At a meeting in Birmingham the year before he severely criticised the Gladstone administration because of their extravagant war budget. Among other things he declared at that time that "the business of the British Government is to . . . . maintain a rigid economy" and he "would not for the sake of a kingdom have it otherwise." [8]

[1] *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches,* vol. ii, p. 140.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 129.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 130.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 184.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 131.

[6] Justin McCarthy, *op. cit.,* vol. iii, p. 201.

[7] *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches,* vol. ii, pp. 280-281.

[8] *Manchester Guardian,* April 16, 1884, p. 8.

Not only did he oppose big armaments on the score of economy but also by reason of his belief in a peaceful foreign policy. In an elaborate statement in the House of Commons, with respect to his rejected estimates for the army and navy, he said that he did not have in mind "that kind of peace which is a flattering phrase of a platform peroration, but . . . . a genuine, peaceful, foreign policy which should be marked by the absence of unnecessary irritatives." [1] A wise foreign policy, he stated in his letter of resignation to Lord Salisbury, "will extricate England from Continental struggles and keep her outside of German, Russian, French or Austrian disputes. I have for some time," he added, "observed a tendency in the Government's attitude to pursue a different line of action which I have not been able to modify or check." [2]

At least one of Lord Randolph's critics has pointed out that he had not always spoken in this strain. The *Spectator,* in its issue of 1 January 1887, immediately following the resignation, contained a letter which inconveniently called attention to the fact that in the autumn of 1885, in the course of an interview with a reporter of the *Pall Mall Gazette,* he expressed himself in favour of a policy which assured "protection for everybody and a Government that will feel no timidity about spending money." [3] It may well be that Lord Randolph did give utterance to this sentiment. At that time he had India in mind and India then was the center of anxious concern because of the attitude of Russia. Furthermore he was then the Secretary of State for India and his Tory democratic faith in maintaining the Empire was quite pronounced at that critical juncture of affairs. As Mr. Jennings has well pointed out, additional expenditures were

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 3rd ser., vol. 310: 63.

[2] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.,* vol. ii, p. 235.

[3] The *Spectator,* Jan. 1, 1887, p. 11.

urgent at that crisis and Lord Randolph "did not for a moment hesitate to press it upon the House of Commons and the country. He has never objected to any expenditure that might be necessary for the defense and security of the Empire." Mr. Jennings then goes on to say that what he did insist upon was that the Government's money should not be "muddled away in extravagant contracts or in maintaining superfluous officials in the public department" but should be spent to good advantage.[1]

Lord Randolph's budget was essentially democratic. As the *Saturday Review* observed "a free breakfast table was to be provided for the masses at the cost of taxes put on the luxuries of the rich."[2] Mr. Chamberlain in the course of a speech in Birmingham remarked that Lord Randolph Churchill's fiscal policy indicated "a desire to redistribute the burden of taxation as between rich and poor,"[3] and Lord Rosebery once remarked that if Lord Randolph had remained in office his budget schemes would have startled the country—"that he was prepared to tax the very cartridges" with which the Tories "killed or missed their game."[4]

What reaction followed this Cabinet crisis? Mr. Chamberlain was frankly disappointed and discouraged. He asserted that Lord Randolph's retirement meant "the victory in the Conservative Government of the stupid and noxious Toryism opposed to all serious improvement."[5] In his speech at Birmingham to which reference has already been made he declared that the presence of Lord Randolph Churchill in the Cabinet had been a guarantee that a reactionary

[1] *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches*, vol. i (Intro.), p. xxvi.

[2] *Saturday Review*, Jan. 26, 1895, p. 117.

[3] The *Standard*, Dec. 23, 1886, p. 5.

[4] Lord Rosebery, *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, p. 150.

[5] *Nineteenth Century*, 1887 (vol. 21), p. 163.

policy would not be adopted. He expressed great concern because the extreme Tory influence had gained the upper hand. He said that he had been under the impression that the "Tories had grown wise by experience and that they were prepared to govern in a liberal spirit." Such a conclusion, in the light of Lord Randolph's retirement, he went on to say, did not seem to be the case.[1]

As for the old Tories they were exultant. The "old gang" were avenged. Lord Randolph had assailed them often enough in the past and now their time had come. Considerable space would be needed to record the expressions of opprobrium which were now heaped on the former Chancellor of the Exchequer. As he himself once remarked, he was subjected to a "tornado of slander, obloquy and every variety of misrepresentation."[2] The pent-up rage of the reactionaries who had been cowed and silenced by his success and dominating position in the party's councils now found full vent. A certain section of the Tory press was particularly bitter. The *Standard* said that the disgraceful manner in which he had retired was "just what might have been expected." Fluency and rhetoric, according to this publication, were his main assets. He had become a "source of weakness to the Government rather than an element of strength" and they should be grateful to be rid of his presence.[3] Five days later the same Tory organ unburdened itself of a still more hostile attack. The Government was to be congratulated because of its escape and the renegade must never in the future, under any circumstances, be allowed to return to any place of importance in the party's councils.[4]

[1] The *Standard,* Dec. 23, 1886, p. 5.

[2] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 267.

[3] The *Standard,* Dec. 24, 1886, p. 5.

[4] *Ibid.,* Dec. 29, 1886, p. 5,—in its issue of May 5, 1884 the *Standard* likewise congratulated the Tory party on the occasion of his resigning from the National Union. His elimination in both instances was regarded as highly desirable. The *Standard,* May 5, 1884, p. 5.

The *Saturday Review* also assailed the fallen leader. Lord Randolph, in its opinion, had a most "confused notion of political principles" and was "not too scrupulous in his ideas of political methods." The attack then proceeded as follows:

> There has been a vast amount of silly and almost dishonest talk as to democracy, democratic needs and the like which had much better be hushed up or else the utterers of it purged out. If any one prefers Radical principles let him in God's name be a Radical and as such an honest man like Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Morley, Sir George Trevelyan and others.[1]

This publication with its high-Tory style in the following issue observed that the effect of the resignation had not been so disastrous as some had apprehended. "No wholesale exit of members took place, no excited mobs of Tory Democrats demanded Lord Randolph's return or Lord Salisbury's head." [2]

How is this feeling of hostility to be explained? The intense dislike of Tory Democracy which obtained in some quarters is one answer. The bitter comment in the *Saturday Review* article which frankly despised the "silly and almost dishonest talk of democracy" is a fair illustration of the animosity which was displayed so freely at that time. Again, Lord Randolph Churchill in his fight for Tory Democracy had made many enemies. The necessity of combating the party machine together with his consistent opposition to the Liberals naturally developed a combative temperament which in turn won him more enemies than friends. It has also been suggested that his colleagues were none too friendly because he dwarfed them.[3] He was the one interest-

[1] *Saturday Review*, Dec. 25, 1886, p. 8.

[2] *Ibid.*, Jan. 1, 1887, p. 2.

[3] *Quarterly Review*, 1907 (vol. 206) p. 246.

ing figure in the Cabinet. Justin McCarthy has remarked that "the eyes of the public were turned almost exclusively on him."[1] In discharging his new duties he had displayed unexpected and unusual administrative abilities. He had been a most successful Secretary of State for India and there was every indication that his career as Chancellor of the Exchequer would be equally brilliant. These facts, coupled with his new and progressive outlook, produced an irritation throughout British officialdom, which experienced a sense of relief at his departure.

According to most accounts Lord Salisbury was likewise glad to be rid of this aggressive and determined reformer. In 1867 he opposed Disraeli and his reform programme. At that time he himself withdrew from the Government in a mood of reactionary protest.[2] In 1886 he allowed Lord Randolph to withdraw. Tory democratic reformers were uncongenial colleagues. Hence, after Lord Randolph's retirement, he resigned himself to his loss with satisfaction and complacency.

Another explanation of the readiness to drop Lord Randolph was due to the fact that the Tories were now firmly and safely established in office. Matthew Arnold once asserted that the Conservatives reached their zenith in 1886.[3] The party no longer was dependant on the vitalizing energy which Churchill and the Tory Democrats so effectively supplied when its resources were at a low ebb. They knew well enough that he had restored its lost strength and that he alone among the Conservative leaders had a personal hold on the masses which was the source of that strength.[4] The

[1] Justin McCarthy, *op. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 199.

[2] It must be remembered, however, that Lord Salisbury believed that his action was necessitated by the requirements of political honour and integrity. *Cf. supra*, p. 46.

[3] *Nineteenth Century*, 1887, p. 148.

[4] *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. xii, p. 45.

elections of 1885 fully demonstrated that fact. The party had been strongest in those constituencies where the gospel of Tory Democracy had been most disseminated. During the campaign of 1885 Lord Randolph had spoken chiefly in the industrial centers and there the Conservatives had won 118 seats and the Liberals 100. Even John Bright had been nearly routed in Birmingham. In the counties which were under the control of the unbending Tories the Liberals had made big gains and were in the majority. The *Times* in an editorial commenting on this situation remarked that it was "well understood that the author of the transformation scene is Lord Randolph Churchill. . . . Upon the whole," continues the *Times,*

> the forward school have effected a very considerable revolution in the Conservative party . . . thanks to the bid for popular support so successfully made by Lord Randolph Churchill. . . . The new Conservative movement must . . . be welcomed. Nothing could well be worse than the stagnation into which the Conservative party had been sinking.[1]

The success which had crowned his efforts and those of his associates abundantly justified everything which Lord Randolph had claimed in behalf of his advanced beliefs and methods.

A consideration, then, of all these factors, including the treatment accorded to Lord Randolph in connection with his resignation, warrants the conclusion that when Conservatism was feeble and needed to be strengthened Tory Democracy was welcomed by the party "patriarchs and pontiffs"—welcomed perhaps as a disagreeable necessity—but still welcomed. When, however, the party's position was well established and its leaders were safely in office, Tory Democrats were not considered so important or desirable. That was the experience which befell Sir John Gorst. It

[1] The *Times* (weekly edition), June 19, 1885, p. 11.

was the same in the case of Lord Randolph Churchill. A similar situation obtained after 1895. But when in 1906 there was need of vitalizing the party its leaders turned again to Tory Democracy as will be duly noted in a subsequent chapter. Nor was Disraeli an exception. If the "Old Guard" had been able it would have gladly relegated him on more than one occasion to the status of a private member. As it was he suffered more abuse and maledictions in his day than Lord Randolph ever did. But Disraeli was capable of more patience than his disciple. His political make-up was of a tougher texture. He had a greater capacity for compromise and could "go on all his life struggling against cliques." This was a prospect from which Lord Randolph shrank. So he withdrew from the contest. He preferred fighting for his cause outside the cramped precincts of a party cabal.

During the remaining years of his public career Lord Randolph Churchill was excluded from the inner circle of Toryism. He did not, however, turn on his former colleagues as some had hoped and others had feared. At times he disagreed with their policy and even bitterly attacked them but as a rule he supported his party. At the time of his resignation it was rumored that he intended to form a new political organization in company with Mr. Chamberlain,[1] but he quieted all such reports by telling his Paddington constituents that he would direct his efforts to building up the popular strength of Conservatism.[2] This he did in the face of distrust, suspicion, slander and every form of opposition.

As for his Tory Democracy, it grew with the increasing years. Adversity seemed to quicken his zeal as a reformer. In this respect his later political career differed from that

[1] *Saturday Review,* Dec. 25, 1886, p. 825.

[2] The *Times* (weekly edition), April 8, 1887, p. 6.

of Disraeli, whose reforming and liberal propensities were somewhat dulled by political success.[1] The triumphant Prime Minister who emerged so successfully from his encounters at the Berlin Congress and his financial dealings with the Khedive of Egypt was not the Disraeli of *Coningsby* and *Sybil*. An orthodox aristocracy made Disraeli its spoiled child. The plaudits of Sovereign, Parliament and people during his last years made it difficult for him to hear the demands for new reforms. Lord Randolph Churchill suffered from no such distractions. His public utterances became more pronounced in their radicalism. This, in turn, provoked greater criticism on the part of the more orthodox Tories who regarded him with increasing alarm. Addressing the Conservatives in the House of Commons he said that he was well aware of the fact that certain members of his party believed "that of all dangerous Radicals who ever existed, the member for Paddington" was "the most dangerous."[2] Although the reactionaries regarded him with disapproval, the younger and more progressive elements, together with the workers, listened to him eagerly and gave evidence of their cordial admiration and support. This esteem was attested in an unusual manner at Nottingham shortly after his resignation, where he received an ovation from the Conservative workingmen, which in its excessive enthusiasm indicated clearly enough how he was regarded in that quarter.[3]

His speeches now had to do largely with retrenchment and the reform of governmental expenditures. At a meeting in Wolverhampton in the early part of June, 1887, he showed how the army and naval expenses of the country considerably

[1] This is true only of the last few years of his career. Until 1878, as has been pointed out, he continued to be the consistent champion of reform.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 310: 290.

[3] The *Times* (weekly edition), April 23, 1887, p. 6.

exceeded those of Germany as well as those of France. He set forth an amazing array of facts showing the incompetence and waste which obtained in those two big spending departments.[1] The extravagant sums paid for pensions and needless officials as well as the expenses required for sinecure posts and the ornamental but costly trappings of the diplomatic service provoked an indignant protest on this and subsequent occasions.[2]

During the latter part of April (1887) he made two important addresses in which he attacked Mr. Goschen's first budget because it disregarded financial reform.[3] A few months later in the House of Commons he again returned to the subject.[4] Economy in the public service received his attention in a speech at Whitby in the autumn of 1887.[5] The price he had paid in behalf of retrenchment, accounts for the frequency and the excessive vigour of his remarks. There was "nothing more utterly wicked on the part of any Government than wasteful and improvident expenditure of public money," he asserted at Whitby, "and nothing," was "more utterly abominable . . . . than unnecessary imposition of high taxes."[6] At Wolverhampton he said that he wanted to make the people as "furious and angry" as he himself was with respect to the evil of governmental waste and extravagance.[7] This campaign seems to have been fruitful because in a speech at Stockport six weeks later he expressed a sense of gratification in the changed attitude of

[1] *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches*, vol. ii, pp. 178-202.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 353-356.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 164-177.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 202-216.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 217-221.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 278.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 190-191.

the Government.[1] They had not only effected economies but had reduced taxation and devised "a new indirect tax on luxuries" which the *Spectator* observed, was heartily approved by Lord Randolph.[2] Such a policy, he said was highly commendable because in the first place it would help the nation and secondly it would "tend to make the Unionist party and the Unionist Government more popular and more strong" when it was realized that they were pursuing "a truly economical and thrifty" policy and that they cared "above everything else for the relief of the people from burdensome and oppressive taxation." [3]

By October he was giving his attention to other reforms. In Sunderland[4] he dealt with the "one man one vote" issue which he cordially supported. He also favoured reform of the land laws whereby "all entail of landed estates upon unborn lives should be illegal and void." [5] He alluded to the Employers' Liability Act of 1880 and referred to the fact that he had sought at the time of its enactment to increase the scope of the measure and make it compulsory.[6] In this speech he stated his objection to a protective tariff [7] which should be kept in mind, in view of the fact that twenty years later the tariff reformers in the Unionist party were to make the claim that Lord Randolph Churchill and Tory Democracy had been favourable to their fiscal theories.[8] He also made a strong plea for free elementary education. It

[1] *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches,* vol. ii, p. 275.

[2] The *Spectator,* April 14, 1888, p. 500.

[3] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill,* vol. ii, p. 278.

[4] *Ibid.,* pp. 224-241.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 226.

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 227.

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 228.

[8] See an article in *Nineteenth Century,* 1908, (vol. 63) pp. 354-364.

was "very difficult," he maintained, "to combine compulsory education . . . . with compulsory payment of fees." Such a system, he said, frequently worked a "great hardship on the struggling and labouring poor." Hence he favoured the State removing this burden. To bring "education freely to every child in England," he declared, was "the truest Conservative legislation." He also spoke of the desirability of changing the licensing laws so as to promote temperance. "If by temperance legislation," he said, "or educational legislation you can increase the material prosperity of English homes, you have done nearly all that you can for the happiness of the people throughout the country." [1]

On 9 April 1888, Lord Randolph spoke at length in Birmingham. He had appeared frequently before Birmingham audiences and had, on those occasions, given expression to his more advanced views. It was his ambition at one time to represent this constituency in Parliament because the prevailing political sentiment of the city was quite in harmony with his policies. Could such an arrangement have been effected he believed his position as the leader of Tory Democracy would have been strengthened.[2] On one occasion he expressed great admiration for the reforms which had originated there under Liberal auspices. "These reforms," he asserted, "had enlarged the boundaries of freedom, removed religious and civil disabilities, brought the constitution into the home and cottage of the artisan, and taught the people that there were in the political life of monarchies and nations higher aims than perpetual war or constant striving after territorial aggrandizement." [3]

His Birmingham speech of April, 1888, reviewed the status of the Unionist Government which was then in power,

[1] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill,* vol. ii, p. 236.

[2] H. W. Lucy, *Memories of Eight Parliaments,* p. 266.

[3] *Manchester Guardian,* April 16, 1884, p. 8.

and the programme which they were endeavouring to effect. The tenor of his remarks was essentially Tory democratic. The Birmingham *Daily Post* in its editorial comment described his message as "frankly and outspokenly democratic." [1]

At the outset he spoke of the desirability of a Government in power having a fairly small majority. This he contended, would necessitate a fuller consideration of the needs of the people. A Government possessed of an "overwhelming Parliamentary strength," he said, was prone to be disdainful, over-confident, lax and careless in the discharge of administrative and other governmental duties. His purpose was to show that the main advantage of party government consisted in one organization watching the actions of the other to the end that the one in power may be held to a strict accountability. A strong minority party to make criticism effective, to watch vigilantly and discipline the majority party on occasion was, in his opinion, essential to good government. He therefore considerd the relative parliamentary strength of Conservatives and Liberals at that time as highly satisfactory.

He commented on the fact that the Tory members, for the first time in history, were representatives of the workers in the large cities and that they were in closer touch with the masses of the people than they had ever been before,—a situation which he considered desirable and healthful. He then dealt with the Government's Irish policy and sounded a note of warning with respect to relying too exclusively on coercive methods. The Tory Government of 1874, he said, made that error. The same indictment was to be brought against the Gladstone Government of 1880. He hoped the Conservatives would avoid this mistake and pass needed leg-

[1] Birmingham *Daily Post*, April 10, 1888, p. 4.

islation in behalf of Ireland which had suffered much because of the English blunders of the past. Such a course, he insisted, was all the more imperative because they had always put forth the claim that the Imperial Parliament could do more for Ireland than a Parliament at Dublin would be able to accomplish. The speaker next reviewed the Local Government Bill which had just been introduced. It was a Bill which, Lord Randolph affirmed, was based upon a "purely democratic foundation" and consequently received his commendation. "The Radical Party," he said, were "terribly flustered and taken aback when the Act was introduced." They had never thought it possible for the Tories to be capable of such an advanced measure. He referred to the principle of local option being "embalmed and enshrined in the Bill." While he was hopeful of this feature being retained, he realized the possibility of being obliged to eliminate it.[1] In conclusion, Lord Randolph declared that the situation which he had described was peculiarly satisfactory to him personally because it was a realization of "what was some years ago apparently only a dream, the dream of Tory Democracy." He referred to the "scoffs and scornings . . . . sneers and ridicule" which had greeted his first use of the phrase in the House of Commons in 1882. He added that the people of Birmingham were the first to associate themselves with this political movement.[2]

The *Spectator,* in its issue a few days later, commented at considerable length on the Birmingham address. Attention was properly called to the fact that Disraeli had made use of the same line of reasoning as Lord Randolph with respect to the danger and undesirability of an "overwhelming Parliamentary strength" by the party in office. While the writer agreed with this contention, he rejected the assump-

[1] This is what actually happened, as will be noted in a subsequent chapter.

[2] Birmingham *Daily Post,* April 10, 1888, p. 7.

tion of Lord Randolph in claiming that the policy being pursued by the Government at that time was a realization of the "political aspirations which he . . . once christened by the name 'Tory Democracy.'" It was democratic but not Tory. The democracy of Lord Hartington was more in evidence than that of the Tories. "Liberal Democracy," "Moderate Democracy," "Conservative Democracy" were terms better suited to the situation. A Tory Democracy would imply greater increase of the Royal prerogative. The *Spectator* doubted whether Lord Randolph had any such thought in mind. Lord Beaconsfield was quoted at length to show that he was favourable to such an ideal. But it was lacking in his follower and in the Government whose Tory Democracy had been lauded in the Birmingham speech.[1]

The subject which engaged the attention of Lord Randolph Churchill more than any other during his later years was that of Ireland. This was in the nature of things as the Irish problem continued to be the one dominating political issue. As in former years, Lord Randolph sincerely wanted to see the Irish people get generous and fair consideration. Speaking in the House of Commons, 25 April 1888, he severely condemned the attitude of the Salisbury Ministry in failing to extend the principle of local government to Ireland. The immediate incident which provoked his protest consisted in Mr. Balfour's remarks opposing such a measure on the ground that Irish local bodies had given so poor an account of themselves as to prove that they were not fitted for an extension of this privilege. Lord Randolph, conscious of party promises at the last election, sharply took issue with his former political comrade. He reminded his party that in the campaign of 1886 their pledges "were large and liberal." The Irish had been promised without reservation that they would receive "the same

[1] The *Spectator*, April 14, 1888, p. 500.

amount of local liberty" which England enjoyed, and furthermore, it was to be granted at the "very earliest opportunity." Nothing, he said, was specified at the time these promises were made, about the unfitness of the people for self-government. The pledge, he repeated, was made without reservations. Such a policy, he maintained, constituted the basis of the Unionist party. "That," he added . . . . "is the only platform on which you can resist Repeal." He forcibly depicted the futility and injustice of regarding the Irish "as an inferior community" which seemed to be the conception of Mr. Balfour. If the Irish people were granted the same liberties, he went on to say, as were accorded the English, much of the "ill-feeling that" had "been produced in recent years" would be mitigated.[1]

Some three weeks later he returned to the same question in a speech at Preston. He replied to those enemies of a generous policy who based their contention on the plea of Ireland's unfitness for self-government because of the scandals attending the administration of affairs in that country by local bodies. This, he pointed out, was "a very double-edged argument." He related at length the scandalous and gross mismanagement of local affairs by the Metropolitan Board of Works in London. Other instances of a like nature were quoted. The House of Commons was referred to as not having been wholly incorruptible, a circumstance, he maintained, which had not deterred Parliament from extending the privileges of "popular government" in England. He added that Ireland should not be an exception to the same enlightened principle.[2]

As time progressed Lord Randolph's criticisms of Mr. Balfour's Irish policy became more severe. Addressing a Birmingham audience on 30 July 1889, he frankly admitted

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 325, 507.

[2] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. ii, p. 349.

that to many members of his party his views on Ireland were considered heterodox. He predicted that his speech on the present occasion would not change that opinion. He referred to the smug, self-satisfied Tories whom he likened to Dickens' " Podsnap." He said that the " Podsnaps " hated him and believed that he was doing a great deal of harm in the world because of his advanced views. He remarked that " the trouble with the ' Podsnaps ' was the fact that they were well established in life and had no sympathy with those who were less fortunate." He said they were " especially intolerant of Irish unrest and discontent." This intolerance, he went on to say, produced " a corresponding rancour and hatred against " the English. He urged the desirability of having " recourse to justice, to liberality, to generosity and above all to sympathy," in dealing with the question. He maintained that the Unionists were under obligations of the deepest sort to carry out a policy of conciliation. He had testified to this often in the House of Commons, he remarked, and the result was that many of his friends had been greatly annoyed. He insisted that the people would not forgive the Unionist party if they did not effect in a practical and honest manner an amicable settlement of the Irish problem along lines which had been so freely promised in the last elections. Throughout his speech he stressed the fact that the elections of 1886 showed that the voters, while they were opposed to a Dublin Parliament, were equally expressive in demanding justice for Ireland.

He deplored the evictions which had recently taken place, mentioning particularly those on the Ponsonby estate. He also criticised the placing Irish members of Parliament in prison. The conflicts between the police and people and the prohibiting of public meetings by the executive authorities were to be reprehended. There obtained at that time, he said, a state of things for which history had no

parallel in that there existed great material prosperity and acute political discontent. The Government should miss no opportunity to remove this disaffection. The repressive methods which were then in practice only aggravated the situation. "In no period of the world's history . . ." he went on to say "has a policy of police ever conciliated a disaffected people. It is rather to legislation of a conciliatory character that we ought to look . . . to legislation which shows a disposition to trust the Irish people as we have trusted the English and the Scotch and the Welsh people." Laws which were constructive and not repressive should be passed. "A large and generous policy," he continued, "would be welcomed by many prominent members of the Nationalist party in Ireland."

Directing his thoughts to what should constitute a just and a conciliatory policy he declared that it must take the form of popular local government. The local bodies should be elected in a truly popular manner. No fancy franchise nor plural voting "ought to be allowed to vitiate the representative character of that body." He then proceeded to show how such a reform would in conjunction with other agencies create a new and better order of society. If Ireland had local assemblies and local political interests they would be absorbed in those affairs and thus have less desire to spend their energies and time in agitation and reprisals. He further asserted that the Roman Catholic Church was "always on the side of order and law." If measures were taken to restore Ireland to some degree of quietude this potent religious agency would be a helpful force in maintaining stable conditions.

An obstacle to better conditions consisted in the fact that the big majority of those who would form the electorate for the local bodies were "occupiers of land and the small minority of them" were "the owners of land." It was necessary,

he said, to face the situation as it existed and understand that there was "an hereditary ingrained conviction in the mind of the Irish peasant that the owner of the land has no moral title to the payment of rent." Lord Randolph also pointed out that the gulf which separated the owner of the land and the occupier was greatly widened by the religious factor. How then could the problem be solved? The speaker at this point set forth a proposal which was later realized in various land acts, the most noteworthy of which was the Wyndham Act of 1903. He stated that "the purchase by the peasantry of land . . . the creation of a great peasant proprietary all over Ireland is the only solution of the difficult question: and that means that we, the British people, are to advance the Irish peasantry a loan of money for that purpose." [1]

No phase of the Irish question served to arouse Lord Randolph Churchill's indignation more than the Piggott affair. This "squalid fraud," as Viscount Morley once called it, concerned an Irish journalist by the name of Richard Piggot who supplied the *Times* with letters involving Mr. Parnell. They were used in a series of articles entitled "Parnellism and Crime" which were published with the hope of strengthening and justifying the rigorous policy which the Government were then applying to the Irish situation. One of these letters,[2] purporting to have been written by Mr. Parnell, extenuated the perpetration of the Phoenix Park murders. Like the others, it was credulously accepted as authentic. Both Lord Salisbury and the *Times* vouched for its genuineness.[3] The Government took cognizance of the whole matter and appointed a commission to investigate the charge contained in the *Times* articles. In the meantime Piggot con-

[1] The *Times*, July 31, 1889, p. 10.

[2] *Ibid.* (weekly edition), April 22, 1887, p. 2.

[3] John Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, vol. iii, p. 392.

fessed to Mr. Labouchere that the letters were forgeries, fled to Madrid and there committed suicide. The Commission's report which was made 13 February 1890, included both censure and acquittal for Mr. Parnell and his followers.

A month later Lord Randolph addressed himself to this report. His speech was a bitter indictment of the Government's record in dealing with the whole matter. At the outset he condemned the setting aside of the ordinary Law Courts of the nation in undertaking the investigation of charges brought not merely against individuals but against political opponents, which procedure, he declared, was all the more reprehensible because the Conservatives normally prided themselves on being "a Constitutional Government." Other unconstitutional methods were used which amounted to a "gross injustice." He declared that "in the last century or century and a half no public men had been exposed to such a trial and test" as Mr. Parnell and his friends. This unconstitutional proceeding had been made possible by a "ruthless use of the closure." He recalled the many eloquent and fervid protests which had been made by the so called "Constitutional party" in 1882 against the danger of using just such methods. He could not understand how "a party that made those declarations in 1882 should sanction this misuse of the closure in 1888." He reminded the House that he had frequently "been reproached for inconsistency" but such a charge in the future would come with ill grace from any member of the Front Bench. They had used "that most unconstitutional and dangerous innovation in a most unconstitutional and dangerous manner," in order to thrust an obnoxious measure "down the throats" of a hostile minority. Such action he stigmatized as a "tremendous instrument of oppression," which was worthy of the harsh methods of the Tudors. Parliament had struggled against that sort of thing for centuries. It was "arbitrary

and tyrannical." It was a procedure which "would have startled and alarmed even Lord Eldon." "Lords Lyndhurst and Brougham would have protested against" it. If Lord Cairns had been alive the Tory party would not have stooped to such a method. But a Nemesis in the form of Piggott was visited on the Government because of their unconstitutional behaviour. "What," he exclaimed, "has been the result of this mountainous parturition? A thing, a reptile, a monster—Piggott! What with all your skill, with all your cleverness has been the result? A ghastly, bloody, rotten foetus—Piggott! Piggott!! Piggott!!!" That, he said, was the Government's Nemesis and he hoped a similar fate would "always inevitably await the British Government when they depart flagrantly from constitutional courses." Answering his own question as to why he brought this matter before the House, he asserted that the day might come when "the Constitutional Party" would find itself "in a position of political inferiority similar to that which it occupied in 1832" when its voice might be "stifled" and when "individual political opponents" might "be proceeded against" as they had proceeded against their "political opponents." He then continued as follows: "I can imagine no excess of Parliamentary oppression by a majority of a minority, which could not be palliated and covered . . . . and fortified by this precedent which you have yourselves created." He next passed to a consideration of that phase of the report which censured the Irish members. Before they voted on that proposal, he said that they should reflect on the necessity of condemning the *Times* for its "atrocious libel" on Mr. Parnell and his colleagues. He hoped that even at this eleventh hour the Government would abandon their determination to accept the Parnell Report and thus make some amends for a grievous mistake. He trusted that this would be done "without displaying . . . .

party passion . . . . vindictiveness or . . . . rancour . . . but acting solely on constitutional grounds . . . . set up a sign-post full of warning, instruction and guidance to the Parliaments yet unborn." [1]

It is hardly necessary to add that Lord Randolph Churchill's outburst was received with cheers by the Irish members and bitter silence by his own party. "No response came from his own side." [2] On the contrary he was denounced by the Tory press as a traitor.[3] Strangely enough Mr. Chamberlain characterized his philippic as a "constitutional speech on a grave subject couched in moderate language." [4] Although a portion of the speech might have been in questionable taste, as the *Annual Register* suggested,[5] it shows Lord Randolph Churchill in the guise of a real friend of Ireland, the cause of justice and the rights of minorities. Nor were the Irish unappreciative of that fact. Five years later when tributes were paid to his memory in the House of Commons on the occasion of his untimely end, Mr. Justin McCarthy remarked that Lord Randolph Churchill "had much sympathy with the" Irish people and in his death they had lost a friend.[6] His son likewise was of the opinion that Ireland was the poorer because of his passing off the political scene at a comparatively early age "for more than any other Unionist of authority he understood the Irish people—their pride, their wants, their failings, their true inspiration." [7]

The assertion by Mr. Churchill that his father's Tory Democracy was more pronounced during his later years is

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd ser., vol. 342: 512-522.

[2] Reginald Lucas, *op. cit.*, p. 329.

[3] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 421.

[4] The *Times*, March 12, 1890, p. 6.

[5] *Annual Register*, 1890, pp. 68-69.

[6] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th ser., vol. 30: 82.

[7] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 486.

further evidenced by a speech to his constituents at Paddington on which occasion he discussed the political and social problems which were engaging Parliament and the public at the close of 1888.[1] The first part of his discourse was given up to a consideration of foreign affairs. He made a plea for a policy of conciliation, peace and good-will, all of which was quite in accord with his previous expressions on international affairs. He discussed at some length the strained relations which, at that time, existed between the Salisbury Government and the Cleveland Administration in Washington. In the negotiations which were then being carried on he said that it was necessary to maintain "an attitude towards America of the most imperturbable good-humour." He told his audience that the Americans were "essentially a just people . . . . and although . . . . a proud people and though they" had "a right to be a proud people" they were "by no means quarrelsome . . . . and . . . . excitable" and so there should be no difficulty in maintaining amicable and friendly relations. He then went on to present the American point of view with respect to the dismissal of Lord Sackville. Looked at, he said, in a "fair and impartial" manner it was necessary to recognize that the English "were primarily wrong." Lord Sackville's blunder, he continued, "was without excuse" and the British public had no right "to exhibit any great anger or vexation." He deplored the spirit of braggadocio and insult which characterized a portion of the press. The prospect of war between the United States and England was to his mind the "most appalling prospect" he could imagine. He utterly refused "to consider it possible for a moment." And if the writers of some of the provocative and menacing articles which were appearing in the press knew the incalculable harm they were doing "they would rather smash up their pens

[1] *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches*, vol. ii, pp. 362-373.

and tear up their paper than write one line or one word" more. He likewise expressed his disapproval of the policy of "sneers and sulks" which obtained in some quarters. He also warned his audience against regarding too seriously that portion of the American press which catered to the Irish vote. He added that he had travelled in America and knew that the mass of the people had no hostile feelings toward England. In fact he had often been assured by representative Americans that in the event of Great Britain being involved "in a struggle for its existence" there would be a general desire to come to the aid "of the mother-country."[1] In this manner did Lord Randolph arouse a feeling of friendliness and understanding at a time when some agencies were appealing to the worst prejudices of the people.

After an allusion to the Irish situation the speaker proceeded to discuss some immediate social problems. He called attention to the fact that twenty years before, Lord Beaconsfield had "surprised and arrested the attention . . . . of his party . . . . and the country" with his "legislative motto of *Sanitas sanitatum, omnia sanitas.*" He then proceeded to say that there were certain "great social questions which" demanded urgent "legislative attention." One of these was the housing problem. He said that it was a source of pride to him when he remembered that the Conservatives "were the first to initiate legislation on this subject." This, he remarked, was done when Mr. Disraeli was in office and again by the Salisbury Government in 1885. But those measures were not adequate to deal with the problem as it then existed. Attention was called to the wretched housing conditions obtaining in East London and in other cities, which he declared to be the source of much "misery and crime."[2]

[1] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill,* vol. ii, p. 366.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 372.

The immigration of foreign paupers was spoken of as a problem closely related to that of overcrowding. "The laws of health," he maintained, demanded legislation to deal with this evil. Another matter which received his attention was that of sweating or "cheap labour" as he described it. He referred to the disclosures which had been made by the *Lancet* and by the House of Lords Committee for which Lord Dunraven was largely responsible. While the State could not "regulate the price of labour" it could insist, he maintained, on removing those conditions which existed under the sweating system, and which violated all the "principles of health . . . . decency . . . . and morality."

He also spoke of the drink problem and the possibilities of diverting to other industries some of the 120,000,000 pounds sterling which annually was being spent with the result that the health and morals of a large portion of the population were being ruined. Within the next year or two Lord Randolph was to make several strong pronouncements on this reform, thus defying one of the established traditions of Toryism.

A speech which was delivered at Walsall in July, 1889, also set forth a series of reforms. It was during this year, according to Winston Churchill, that his father's addresses "almost covered and were designed to cover the whole field of Tory Democracy." The Walsall speech is a good example of that fact. An editorial in the *Times* stated that it contained "the programme of Tory Democracy." [2]

A notable feature of his visit at Walsall was the presentation of an address by the Conservative Workingman's Club, in which reference was made to Lord Randolph's efforts to "render the Tory party a truly popular party." Replying to the tribute which had been tendered him he commented upon

[1] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 404.

[2] The *Times*, July 31, 1889, p. 9.

the necessity of popularizing the party's organization. He declared that the organization at Walsall was flourishing because it had "sprung spontaneously from among the people themselves." They were not "wire pulled by a knot of persons in a certain position or station in life as used to be the case with the Conservative party . . . . in the old days." At this point he criticised the procedure of a Conservative meeting that had recently been held, at which the Prime Minister had spoken and from which the press was excluded. "That," he went on to say "is not the way to get the people at your back."

In the course of his principal speech he said that the Tory party, because it was the popular party, should make the welfare and improvement of the people its "constant and unremitting care." Toryism was the best instrument "for effecting social reforms" but unfortunately the Government then in power were indifferent to the problems which urgently demanded attention. There were great questions which in his opinion required immediate consideration. To neglect them would produce "an immeasurable amount of want, of misery and of woe." These wrongs, if they remained unredressed, might produce revolution—at least "great disturbance and great riot and great insecurity"—and would constitute a constant source of danger. Outlining a programme for the Government's consideration, he recommended in the first place a reform of the land laws in order to make it more easy for the occupant to become the owner of his own property. He explained that the land question involved the evils of impoverished owners who could not or would not sell and the costly and tedious methods of land transfer. Both defects, he insisted, should be remedied.

He next proceeded to criticise the Government because of their apathy in dealing with the housing problem. "Nothing . . . . absolutely nothing effective," he said, "had

been done." The Acts of 1876 and 1884 were not sufficient to deal with "the frightful overcrowding of the population . . . . in large towns." The report of a Royal Commission, he pointed out, had disclosed a situation which was "not only a scandal and disgrace to wealthy England but . . . . a standing danger to its constitutional liberties." This report, he continued, showed that high rents were "mercilessly exacted." It revealed also the wretched accommodations of tenants and gross neglect on the part of landowners. Lord Randolph then proceeded to outline a scheme for large roomy buildings which had been tried on a small scale but with much success in London. He would have these buildings six stories high and provided with elevators, electric lights and other conveniences. He would also give the local authorities power to make compulsory purchase of necessary building sites. He then went on to say:

> the land so purchased and the buildings so built would belong to the people of the town in which the operations took place because the corporation of the town is merely the representative of the people and merely distributes the rates they raise for the people: and owning the houses would hold them in the name of the people who would be virtually the owners of an enormous proportion of the dwellings in which they lived.

He believed that this scheme would eliminate rack-renting because there would be no motive for such a ruinous system. He explained further that his plan would permit the constructing of parks and would provide for allotments. The social benefits which would result were dwelt upon. "Disease and drunkenness and crime" which were to be traced directly to the bad housing conditions of the masses would be greatly diminished. He maintained that if a working man or woman had no place "to lay his or her head except some miserable kennel" which was not fit for a dog—it was only natural to seek refuge in the public house.

He directed the attention of his hearers to the sweating system and the length of the working-day in certain trades and industries, which evil, he suggested, might be remedied by empowering the State to fix the hours of labour. He referred again to Lord Dunraven's commission and the appalling state of affairs which had been brought to light. There was undisputed proof, he said, that men and women in order to make a bare pittance worked "twenty and even twenty-two hours a day." "It is almost incredible," he continued "and I say labour of that kind is totally inconsistent with either health or strength." He then observed that the eight-hour day had been adopted in some of the colonies and ought to be considered as a possible arrangement for England. "For some inscrutable reason," he declared, the British representative at the Labour Congress in Switzerland was not permitted "to discuss this great question." Big social problems, he added, could never be settled "by refusing to discuss them."

The licensing question again received due and drastic consideration. Control of licensing, according to the Walsall speech, should be in the hands of local authorities. "Popular control," he insisted, "is what every social reformer must advocate for the sale of alcoholic liquor and that the people of each locality should, by means of their representatives", decide the question of licensing. If this power were granted to the people they would wisely use it. The spread and increase of education and temperance societies indicated that the people were enlightened on the subject and "if they had their way would curb and control the traffic." What, he asked, was the obstacle to popular control? The brewers and distillers, he explained, although small in number were very wealthy and "exercised enormous influence." "At least nine-tenths of the publicans were their abject and tied slaves." He declared that the manufacturers of alcoholic

drink were so well organized that they could mobilize and direct their forces on any point which might be threatened. These interests, he said, had intimidated Parliament. "In fact," he added, "they have directly overthrown two Governments." The time had come, in his opinion, to attack their power. He again depicted the great economic gain which would result from directing the enormous drink revenue along more productive channels.[1]

This speech with its attack on the brewers and landed interests greatly incensed the extreme Tories. A few days after its delivery Mr. Jennings wrote him that "the Conservatives" considered him "nothing better than a Socialist."[2] The *Times*, in its columns, observed that Lord Randolph had "propounded a social programme which goes beyond the expectations of Professor Stuart." As for the "Eight Hour Bill," the *Times* remarked, that while it "was too socialistic even for Mr. Morley" it seemed "to have a great fascination for our Tory Democrat."[3] Mr. Chamberlain also was inclined to be critical. Referring to the Walsall and Birmingham speeches he said that the speaker had borrowed his ideas from the extremists of all parties. "He took his socialism from Mr. Burns and Mr. Hyndman: he took his local option from Sir Wilfrid Lawson . . . . and he took his Irish policy from Mr. John Morley. Is this Toryism?" asked Mr. Chamberlain. He was quite certain that the proposals which had been set forth by Lord Randolph would be "repudiated by Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour."[4] Notwithstanding these adverse comments, the Walsall programme was in harmony with the high purposes of Tory Democracy.

[1] The *Times*, July 30, 1889, p. 10.

[2] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 402.

[3] The *Times*, July 31, 1889, p. 9.

[4] W. S. Churchill, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 403.

It furthermore served to remind the party leaders that they were "trustees, not for their own class but for the nation at large." It was also a renewal in concrete form of the Disraelian policy which proclaimed that one of the foremost principles of the Conservative party was to improve "the condition of the people."

CHAPTER V

The Fruitage of Tory Democracy

"Almost all the legislation dealing with labour questions has been initiated by Tory statesmen, and more of it has been passed by Tory governments. The Factory and Workshops Acts, The Mines' Regulation Act, Merchant Shipping legislation, the Acts relating to sanitation, artisans' dwellings, land purchase, allotments, small holdings and free education are all Conservative, and it is therefore historically inaccurate to represent the Tory party as opposed to socialistic legislation." From a speech by Mr. Chamberlain, *Annual Register*, 1892, p. 154.

The tradition of the Tory party with respect to social legislation was well established long before the advent of avowed Tory Democracy. "The earliest steps in the direction of social reform" observed Mr. Bonar Law on one occasion "were taken by the Tory party." [1] Mr. Balfour, speaking in the House of Commons in 1907, said "he believed the House desired the Government seriously to attempt social reform but the majority of such bills had been passed by the Conservative and Unionist Governments." [2] In Birmingham two years later he referred to the fact that there was much discussion about social reform which, he said, ought to be and was the "highest aspiration of a statesman." He declared that it was the greatest and most difficult task which a party leader could undertake. To such a task, he added, the Conservatives had been "attached when their political rivals were still in the individualistic wilderness." [3]

[1] The *Times*, Dec. 17, 1912, p. 8.

[2] *Annual Register*, 1907, p. 14.

[3] Birmingham *Daily Post*, Sept. 23, 1909, p. 7.

"It is perfectly familiar" remarked the Unionist M. P., Mr. Lyttelton, in 1909, "that the hours of labour, the safeguards of life and limb and barriers against death and disease have been long regulated by many Acts of Parliament with which the Unionist party has had a close and a most honourable concern."[1] When Mr. Disraeli, in an interview with Glasgow factory operatives in 1873, expressed himself as favourable to a nine-hour day, the *Glasgow Herald* observed that he was simply acting in the general line of Conservative policy, and then added that "it was not the Liberals who moved most sympathetically with the operatives" when the question of reduced hours first arose.[2]

To contrast the social legislative record of the Conservatives with that of the Liberals has been a favourite theme of those in the former political camp. Mr. Bonar Law, speaking at Ashton-under-Lyne, maintained that his party's record of social legislation in the past had not only surpassed that of the Whigs and Liberals, but Tory measures in behalf of the workers had often been "bitterly opposed by Cobden and Bright."[3] Lord Robert Cecil during the latter period of the Coalition Government, in 1922, remarked that the Conservatives were essentially "social reformers" and it was an error, he maintained, to consider them in any other light. Referring to the record of his party he went on to say: "there was nothing which some of us . . . were more concerned to point out than that the Conservative party, the Tory party, call it what you will, had in its best days done quite as much for the social well-being of their poorer fellow citizens as any party."[4] Indeed there are those who would contend that the Tories and Conservatives did it all. "The

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 4: 354.

[2] *Glasgow Herald*, Nov. 22, 1873, p. 4.

[3] The *Times*, Dec. 17, 1912, p. 8.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 151: 1924.

great social reforms of the nineteenth century were carried out one and all by the Tory party" [1] is the extravagant and unabashed claim of one Conservative writer.

Nor are expressions of this sort confined to partisan adherents. Mr. A. Macdonald, who called himself a "Liberal and Labour M. P.," is reported to have said in 1879 that "the Conservative party had done more for the working classes in five years than the Liberals had in fifty." "You have gained more," he told the miners of Stafford, "from the Conservatives in respect to matters effecting the workingmen than the Liberals would ever dare have granted." [2] The Socialist periodical *Justice,* actuated no doubt by a desire to damage the pretensions of the Liberal party rather than by any attachment for the Conservatives, has made similar assertions. This radical weekly reminds us, that in 1839, the Earl of Shaftesbury moved an amendment to reduce the hours of labour of children from sixty-nine to fifty-eight hours a week, but "his amendment was rejected by the Liberals." Furthermore, the Children in Factories Bill, which Tory members had supported for some years, was defeated by the Liberal Government in 1838. The same article also points out that Lord Shaftesbury and Mr. Sadler "were responsible for a Bill limiting the hours of children to ten hours daily," but that the measure was opposed by the Liberals, including John Bright and Richard Cobden "who fought like tigers in favour of child slavery." [3] In 1909 Victor Grayson and G. R. S. Taylor, the prominent Socialists, stated that "out of thirty Factory Acts of the nineteenth century over twenty were passed by the Conservatives. They also passed the Trade Union Acts except the Act of 1871, which 'in their opinion' almost annihilated the

[1] *Blackwoods Magazine,* 1907 (vol. 182), p. 861.

[2] *Staffordshire Sentinel,* Jan. 18, 1879, p. 6.

[3] *Justice,* Jan. 1, 1910, p. 7, ch. i.

Unions altogether." These advocates of social reform then refer to other Tory legislation in the following terms: "The Housing of the Working Class Act, the first two Workmen's Compensation Acts, the Allotments and Small Holdings Act (except the last) were all passed by hard hearted and reactionary Tories. They have to their credit the Franchise Act and the Master and Servant Act of 1867." [1] In much the same fashion Mr. Ben Tillett, the dockers' leader, once declared: "I should be a hypocrite were I not to say that the Conservatives had done more for the working-classes than the Liberals had." [2]

Much allowance must be made for the partisan bias which denied the Liberals their due credit for a long list of notable remedial acts. The record of social advancement and achievement between the years 1906 and 1914, for instance, is almost unequaled in legislative annals.[3] On the other hand, any account of Tory reform acts during the nineteenth century will go far to substantiate the claims put forth by the foregoing Conservatives and Socialists.

What relation did Tory Democracy sustain towards these reform activities? It is idle to assert that the Tory Democrats were solely responsible for the various beneficient measures which have been passed by the Tory or Conservative party. To maintain such a position would be quite impossible. It would involve trying to prove too much. Many of the bills looking to social and political improvement, which have been enacted during the past century, would probably have been placed on the statute-books in any event. Likewise it would be equally wide of the truth to deny that Tory

[1] *National Unionist Leaflet*, no. 1339.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] For an account of social reforms enacted by the Liberal Government during the years 1906-1914, see Carlton J. H. Hayes, *British Social Politics* (Boston, 1913).

Democrats facilitated and strengthened the efforts of those within the party who were desirous of pursuing an enlightened policy with respect to constructive social and political legislation. Although they may not have been the immediate agents in securing the adoption of various advanced measures, nevertheless it is quite obvious that the policies and ideals of Pitt, Peel, Disraeli, Churchill and other progressive Tories have had a big and determining influence in the successful realization of these measures.

It is necessary, however, to keep in mind other forces which helped produce progressive legislation, particularly that which looked to social betterment. The support and encouragement of Mr. Chamberlain and the Liberal Unionists constituted an important factor. The efforts put forth by organized groups of workers and an aroused social conscience, which manifested itself during the nineteenth century, must be reckoned with. As Justin McCarthy once observed, "Parliament only works through the power of public opinion." [1] Social reforms are primarily due, not to cabinets, but to an aroused public determined to redress the grievances to which its attention has been drawn by speeches, written articles and other forms of agitation. "Modern Governments," wrote Sir John Gorst in 1903, "embark on schemes of change with great reluctance and only under the overpowering compulsion of public opinion." [2] But the public opinion whereof these publicists speak, and the awakened social conscience which has been mentioned, were closely related to Tory Democracy. They were interacting forces. The awakened social conscience helps to explain Tory Democracy, and Tory Democracy, in turn, made its contribution to the development of a keener sense of responsibility on the part of an otherwise indifferent public.

[1] Justin McCarthy, *A History of Our Own Times*, vol. i, pp. 150-151.

[2] *Nineteenth Century*, 1903 (vol. 53), p. 522.

As for the stir which was being made by organized labour to secure better living conditions, suffice it to say that Tory Democracy saw therein certain signs of political portent and acted accordingly. Tory Democrats are not to be numbered among those who learn nothing and forget nothing. If they had had their way Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and his followers would never have secured that power which they have enjoyed in recent years. The die-hards, on the other hand, are much more helpful to the Labourites.

As has been already pointed out, the Tory party were identified with social reforms long before the era of Disraeli, Lord Randolph Churchill and their successors, and this background did much to strengthen them in securing recognition and support for their advanced proposals. In fact, Mr. Chamberlain in a speech at Birmingham in 1892 insisted that the early history of Toryism gave full sanction and encouragement to the ambitious and far-reaching scheme of state regulation of industry which he at that time proposed. If the Unionists adopted such a plan they would simply go "back to the old Tory traditions," [1] he remarked.

To what extent is this claim of Mr. Chamberlain justified? An examination of English statutes in the early half of the nineteenth century goes far to substantiate his contention. The spirit of Tory Democracy was at work as early as 1802 when the Tories passed England's first Factory Act, which was introduced by Sir Robert Peel,[2] the father of the able statesman who came on the political scene a few years later. The Act of 1802, wrote Mr. Clarke in his article, "Labour and Socialism in British Politics," "was the beginning of the end of *laisser faire*." [3] The measure was

[1] *Annual Register*, 1892, p. 154.

[2] Gilbert Slater, *The Making of Modern England* (New York, 1915), pp. 55-56.

[3] Charles A. Beard, *Introduction to the English Historians* (New York, 1906), p. 612.

naturally limited and faulty, and it is not surprising that this "first experiment in legislation for factories failed of its purpose."[1] Consequently, in 1815, Sir Robert Peel again introduced the subject in Parliament. A commission studied the problem and the result was a second Factory Act which was passed in 1819 by another Tory government. The measure provided that no children under nine were to be employed in cotton mills; those under sixteen were prohibited from working between 9 p.m. and 5 a.m. and were limited to a day's work of twelve hours with a "definite time allowance for meals."[2] In 1833, due to the persistent efforts of Richard Oastler, the Tory "Factory King," and the Earl of Shaftesbury, who at that time was sitting on the Conservative side of the House of Commons as Lord Ashley, the Ten Hours' Bill became a law.[3] Michael Sadler, who has been described as "an extreme Tory",[4] was also a zealous advocate and worker in behalf of this reform. Children under nine were prohibited from working in factories, while those under thirteen were not allowed to work more than eight hours a day and young persons under eighteen not more than twelve hours.[5] Although the Ten Hours' Bill was supported by all classes including "Chartists and Socialists, Tories, Whigs and Radicals" its success was greatly facilitated by "an alliance between the radical dissenting working-men on the one hand and an ultra Tory and churchman on the other."[6] Among its most vigorous opponents were the Whig cotton manufacturers, one of whom feared that the Bill, if it became a law, would drive

[1] Frank Tillyard, *The Worker and the State* (London, 1923), p. 22.

[2] *59 Geo. III*, ch. 66.

[3] *3 & 4 Will. IV*, ch. 103.

[4] Traill and Mann, *Social England* (London, 1904), vol. vi, p. 299.

[5] *3 & 4 Wm. IV*, ch. 103.

[6] Arthur Greenwood, *Richard Oastler, "The Factory King"* (Huddersfield, 1913), p. 9.

trade out of the country.[1] Another adherent of the Manchester School stated in the House of Commons that "if such a Bill were to pass into law a blow would be inflicted on the cotton trade from which it would never recover," [2] while the Whig member for Wolverhampton was satisfied that the Act "would prove nothing but a delusion." [3]

Other remedial legislation under Tory auspices at this time comprised an Allotment Act for the benefit of the agricultural labourer.[4] The abolishment of the "truck" system in 1831 [5] also substantiates the claims made by Mr. Chamberlain. This abuse to which Disraeli drew attention in *Sybil* [6] required the worker to be paid not in money but in goods which were valued at exorbitant prices. To remedy this evil two Bills were introduced in the House of Lords by Lord Wharncliffe and, after some opposition in the House of Commons, were finally passed and received the royal assent in 1831.[7]

The genesis of legislation favourable to the cause of trade unions can be traced to Tory legislation during the same period. In 1820 a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate the working of the penal laws. Under the anti-combination laws of 1799 and 1800 it was a criminal misdemeanor for workers to combine together for the purpose of securing shorter hours and higher wages. In 1824 this legislation was repealed by a Tory Government of which Sir Robert Peel, Huskisson and Canning were members.[8]

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 16: 1001.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 16: 1002.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. 16: 879.

[4] *59 Geo. III*, ch. 12.

[5] *What Unionists Have Done for the Workers*, p. 5.

[6] *Sybil*, bk. iii, ch. i.

[7] *I & II Wm. IV*, ch. 36; *I & II Wm. IV*, ch. 37.

[8] *5 Geo. IV*, ch. 95 and *5 Geo. IV*, ch. 129.

In 1841 the Tories under the leadership of Sir Robert Peel came into power and held the reins of government until 1846. Due to the activities of Lord Ashley a Royal Commission on Labour in Mines had been appointed by the Whig government in 1840. The terrible conditions which were revealed are familiar to all students of English industrial history. Immediately after the report of the Commission was published Sir Robert Peel's Government passed the Coal Mines Regulation Act of 1842, which prohibited underground work by females and by boys under ten years of age.[1] Although the Bill commanded general support from all parties nevertheless many Whigs voted against it. Incidentally, the records show that Mr. Gladstone voted with the opponents of the measure.[2]

In 1844, largely through the efforts of Sir James Graham, who at that time was Home Secretary in Sir Robert Peel's Government, the Children's Half Time Act[3] which still further reduced the hours of labour for young people received the royal assent. Mr. Gladstone's indifference to social reform was again indicated by his voting against that clause of the Bill which limited the employment of those under the age of thirteen to ten hours a day.[4]

The Whigs were in power from 1846 to 1852. In 1846 a more satisfactory Ten Hours' Bill was introduced by the Tories and had the cordial support of Disraeli and Lord John Manners. This legislative proposal failed of enactment. In 1847, however, it became law, being passed in the House of Lords by a majority of forty-two.[5] By its bene-

[1] *5 & 6 Vict.*, ch. 99.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 64: 937. It is to be remembered that Mr. Gladstone at this time was still in the Tory party.

[3] *7 & 8 Vict.*, ch. 15.

[4] The *Times*, March 25, 1844, p. 3.

[5] *10 & 11 Vict.*, ch. 29.

ficent provisions the condition of "three-fourths of all persons employed in textile industries" were improved and many others were favourably effected indirectly.[1] Lord Ashley and Mr. Oastler, who were at the head of the "Ten Hours" movement, were largely responsible for the success of the measure. In the House of Commons it met the opposition of John Bright who threatened to bring against the Bill "so formidable a combination of capital that the House could not successfully legislate against it."[2] He also characterized it as "one of the worst measures ever" introduced in Parliament.[3]

The motive which actuated Mr. Bright and his fellow Liberals in opposing this and similar bills[4] must not be attributed to an indifference to the suffering of the masses. As individuals they were as sensitive to the needs of the disinherited and unfortunate as the Tories were. Justin McCarthy assures us that John Bright "loved the working classes and the poor in general."[5] Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Hammond in their illuminating biography of Lord Shaftesbury have made it clear that the Whigs were by no means wanting in humanitarianism. According to a review of this book the "most thought-provoking aspect of the great philanthropist's career" consisted in the fact that while the things which he fought against were devilish, the people who obstructed him and in effect defended the factory abuses

[1] E. P. Cheyney, *Industrial and Social History of England* (New York, 1920), p. 236.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 91: 1144.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. 91: 142.

[4] Professor Ramsay Muir in his *History of the British Commonwealth* denies that the Liberal party as such had opposed the Factory Acts, although he admits that many individual Liberal manufacturers were hostile to their enactment. (Ramsay Muir, *A Short History of the British Commonwealth* (London, 1922, vol. ii, p. 395). But Bright and Cobden had not captured the Liberal party as early as 1833.

[5] Justin McCarthy, *op. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 254.

" were for the most part not devilish at all." [1] The hostility which John Bright and his political associates entertained towards factory legislation was largely due to their wholehearted adherence to the doctrines of the Manchester School, which opposed the interference of the State in industrial and economic affairs. Factory acts were contrary to the Whig and Liberal belief in personal and economic liberty as well as political liberty. " Free contract and personal liberty," writes Hobhouse in his work on *Liberalism,* " lay close to the heart of the whole Liberal movement. Hence the doubts felt by so many Liberals as to the wisdom of regulating industry by law." [2] " Mr. Bright and all the other terrible Manchester men were strongly opposed to what they believed to be an interference with freedom of contract between master and servant," is the opinion expressed in a *Glasgow Herald* editorial.[3] A less charitable explanation of Bright's " vehement and acrimonious hostility to factory legislation," to use the extreme language of Mr. F. H. Rose, a Socialist and Labour candidate for Parliament, is that he belonged to a manufacturing group which feared that too many reforms might interfere with business and profits.[4]

Another reason which has been advanced to explain Whig

[1] *Daily Chronicle* April 23, 1923, p. 4. What Richard Oastler thought of the Whig manufacturers is indicated in the following quotation from a pamphlet written by him in 1836 entitled *The Unjust Judge, or the Sign of the Judge's Skin.* " I never see one of these pious, canting murdering 'Liberal' respectable saints, riding in his carriage, but I remember that the vehicle is built of infants' bones; that it is lined with their skins; that the tassels are made of their hair; the traces and harnesses of their sinews; and that the very oil with which the wheels are greased, is made of infants' blood." Arthur Underwood, *op. cit.,* p. 17.

[2] L. T. Hobhouse, *Liberalism* (London, 1911), p. 36. The Tories, not having adopted these principles, had no such objections to government regulation.

[3] *Glasgow Herald,* Nov. 22, 1873, p. 4.

[4] Frank H. Rose, *The Coming Force* (London, 1909), p. 20.

opposition and Tory advocacy of factory acts was to be found in the jealousy "between the new busy energetic men of wealth" which had been produced by the cotton industry, and the old families of the country whom they greatly excelled in material resources and munificence. When the opportunity presented itself the Tory squires were ready to take the side of the operatives as against the capitalists who were said to be "fattening themselves on the sweat and toil of the pale-faced women and children in the mills." [1] The Tories took advantage of the workers' grievances to help "dish the Whigs." This in turn aligned the manufacturers against reforms, the zeal for which, on the part of the old Tories, was born not so much of a philanthropic temper as of a desire to annoy their political rivals. This explanation, however, is of minor importance. After all, John Bright was doctrinaire to a pugnacious degree and resisted with his accustomed vigour the Ten-Hour movement as well as any other movement which ran counter to his cherished political or economic tenets.

Nor was the attitude of Cobden and Gladstone much more favourable to social reform. The Socialist paper, *Justice,* links Bright and Cobden together, describing them as the "two great demi-gods of Free Trade Liberalism who fought in favour of child slavery." [2] "That Cobdenism should ever be regarded as a 'popular' movement," writes Mr. Clarke in the article already referred to, "can only be attributed to one of those hallucinations which are stronger and more enduring in politics and religion than in any other department of human affairs." [3] As for Mr. Gladstone, he was interested in fiscal and political reform, and in Irish land legislation, but not in labour reform. His antipathy to

[1] *Glasgow Herald,* Nov. 22, 1873, p. 4.

[2] *Justice,* Jan. 1, 1910, p. 7.

[3] C. A. Beard, *op. cit.,* p. 615.

state interference with industrial affairs was much the same as that of Bright and Cobden. In 1891 he was asked by a gas worker as to his views with respect to the "Eight-Hour Day." He sent a reply worthy of the National Association of American Manufacturers. "When I am asked," he wrote, "to impose legal penalties upon any workman who desires and agrees to work more than eight hours per day . . . I must pause before agreeing to this affliction." [1]

A word at this juncture may not be amiss respecting the spirit which animated the Earl of Shaftesbury in his activities for the Ten Hour Bill and other humanitarian objects. His zeal was not partisan. It did not matter to him whether Tory or Whig supported his efforts for human betterment. He insisted that his bills were not brought forward in a party spirit. Replying to a charge that he was seeking to make political capital of his activities, he said that such an accusation "involved a serious charge against him" which he resented. It meant "that he had suffered a great question, involving the rights of humanity, to be perverted into an instrument to work out a mere party matter." [2]

The motive which inspired Tory Democrats has been indicated elsewhere. It was both political and humanitarian. It was born of opportunism and of a genuine concern for the workers. Its roots can be traced back to the era which appealed so strongly to "Young England" and Disraeli. It was an inheritance from the benevolent feudalism of an earlier period which attended to the wants of dependants and the poor by granting protection and the bestowal of alms. More selfish motives also actuated them as has been pointed out in the opening chapter.[3]

[1] *Daily Graphic,* Dec. 14, 1891, p. 8.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates,* 3rd series, vol. 44: 443.

[3] *Cf. supra,* p. 11.

Among the reform activities which engaged the Tories during the middle of the nineteenth century was that of appointing another commission (in 1849) to inquire into the conditions of labour in mines. This investigation resulted in the Mines Act of 1850.[1] In 1852 during the premiership of Lord Derby an Act was passed recognizing Co-operative Societies as separate institutions.[2] In 1859 when Lord Derby was once more installed in office the Government passed the Conspiracy Law Amendment Act [3] which permitted peaceful picketing and further confirmed the freedom of labour and right of combination.[4]

In 1866 the Conservatives enacted a Bill dealing with the problem of ventilation, overcrowding and uncleanliness in factories.[5] Disraeli was now a commanding figure in his party and gave practical expression to his belief that "the health of the people was the most important question for a statesman." In 1867 by the Factories Extension Act [6] the benefits of the Act of 1866 were extended to other industries including iron foundries, blast furnaces, copper mills, the glass, tobacco, paper, printing and book-binding trades. The measure also provided for a more adequate inspection service. About 1,500,000 female and juvenile operatives were favourably effected by this legislation. Lord Shaftesbury, in speaking of the Act said he was unable to express adequately his "deep sense of gratitude" to the Government "for having introduced this Bill" which would carry "comfort and peace" to thousands. "By showing this

[1] *13 & 14 Vict.*, ch. 50.

[2] *15 & 16 Vict.*, ch. 65.

[3] *22 Vict.*, ch. 34.

[4] It is quite true that under the Tory Governments of the fifties and sixties the Tories did not have a majority in the House of Commons. Hence the above measures were not passed by straight party majorities.

[5] *29 & 30 Vict.*, ch. 90.

[6] *30 & 31 Vict.*, ch. 103.

interest in the welfare of the people and by endeavouring in this way to advance their moral, social and physical improvement" the Government, in Lord Shaftesbury's opinion, were doing more for the happiness of the masses than would be accomplished by the great franchise reform which was then being debated. In fact, he believed, the latter measure would be more successful because of the Factory Extension Act.[1]

In 1867 the Workshops Regulation Act became law.[2] This statute, which embraced domestic manufacture as well as labour in workshops or factories and more effectively prohibited child labour, marked a new era in protective legislation and was the starting point for an entirely new series of enactments. Also, in this fruitful year of reform activities, there was placed on the statute-book Lord Elcho's Master and Servant Act which prevented workers being summarily arrested if they broke their contracts with employers.[3] Prior to the enactment of Lord Elcho's measure a worker was subject to imprisonment for breach of contract whereas the master was simply liable to a fine for a like offense. The Bill was later strengthened by Disraeli's Government in 1875 when the Employers and Workmen's Act[4] was passed which freed trade combinations from indictment for conspiracy. It abolished the law which made a breach of contract a criminal offense. The Bill, in short, had the effect of legally giving the worker the right to strike. The Conspiracy Act of 1875,[5] which has been called "the Charter of Trade Unions",[6] was still more favourable

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 189: 1208-1211.

[2] *30 & 31 Vict.*, ch. 146.

[3] *30 & 31 Vict.*, ch. 141.

[4] *38 & 39 Vict.*, ch. 90.

[5] *38 & 39 Vict.*, ch. 86.

[6] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 4: 353.

to the striker. Peaceful picketing was permitted by allowing "attendance at or near a house or place of business for the purpose of communicating information." As a result of this legislation combinations of working-men which prior to 1871 were deemed unlawful were now clearly legalized.[1]

Disraeli's Government in 1867 was responsible for a Conciliation Act to adjust differences between employers and employees.[2] During the same year a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the safeguarding of trade-union property from embezzlement. Another commission in 1867 examined the conditions of the employment of children, young persons and women in agriculture.[3]

Several public health measures were placed on the statute-books by the Conservatives at this time. One was the Public Health (Scotland) Act of 1867 which instituted, for the first time, sanitary inspectors and medical officers.[4] In 1868 two additional Bills were passed which extended the scope of this enactment,[5] and in 1875 a supplementary Act facilitated its administration.[6] The Act of 1878, which gave local authorities power to acquire land for public parks and pleasure grounds in Scotland, was another contribution to the physical well-being of the populace.[7] Two similar Bills for the benefit of England were duly enacted.[8] The most important of these legislative undertakings was Mr. Cross' Comprehensive Public Health Act of 1875, which consoli-

[1] George Howell, *Handy Book of the Labour Laws* (London, 1894), p. 37.

[2] *30 & 31 Vict.*, ch. 105.

[3] Winifred Dolan, *History of Social Reform* (London, 1905), p. 30.

[4] *30 & 31 Vict.*, ch. 101.

[5] *39 & 40 Vict.*, ch. 31; *39 & 40 Vict.*, ch. 75.

[6] *38 & 39 Vict.*, ch. 74.

[7] *41 & 42 Vict.*, ch. 8.

[8] *39 & 40 Vict.*, ch. 56; *40 & 41 Vict.*, ch. 35.

dated and classified all the piece-meal legislation which had been enacted during the preceding thirty years.[1] A Pure Food Bill was passed in 1875 for the purpose of protecting the public from harmful adulterations,[2] and in 1877 a Bill was enacted with a view to improving the lot of those living on canal boats.[3] The Swimming Baths Act[4] and an Act to amend the law relating to Public Baths and Washing Houses[5] were made laws in 1878.

Another problem which engaged the attention of the Disraelian regime, and which is closely related to the doctrine of *Sanitas sanitatum,* was housing. Subsequent Conservative and Unionist governments likewise gave this question earnest consideration as will be duly noted. In fact housing reform from its inception to the present day has been the peculiar domain of Tories, Conservatives and Unionists. Disraeli in his novel *Sybil,* as early as 1844, had depicted the evils of the slums and over-crowding in the larger towns. The beginning of legislation for the mitigation of these abuses is to be traced to a group of " Tory and Radical reformers " under the leadership of Lord Shaftesbury who in 1851 assisted in securing the enactment of the Common Lodging Houses Act.[6] This statute however was very meagre in its scope. The first serious effort to deal with the problem was the Torrens Bill or Artisans Dwellings Act in 1868.[7] This measure had been originally introduced by Mr. Torrens, a Liberal member, as a private Bill in 1866.

[1] *38 & 39 Vict.*, ch. 55.
[2] *38 & 39 Vict.*, ch. 63.
[3] *40 & 41 Vict.*, ch. 60.
[4] *41 Vict.*, ch. 14.
[5] *41 & 42 Vict.*, ch. 14.
[6] *Campaign Guide*, 1922 ed. p 824
[7] *31 & 32 Victoria*, ch. 130

Mr. Gladstone sent it to a select committee where it was shelved. The Disraeli Ministry during its tenure of power secured its passage after certain amendments had been made. Much credit for many of the provisions of the Bill was due to a select committee of the House of Lords under the presidency of Lord Chelmsford. This law which stood the test of twenty-nine years provided "for the taking down or improving dwellings occupied by working-men or their families unfit for human habitation and for the building and maintenance of better dwellings for such persons instead thereof." Provision was made for proper inspection. Any four householders could compel inspection of "any specified house within his jurisdiction." The local authorities were given the power "to enforce the carrying out of the necessary improvements." To give the Act greater effectiveness provisions were made for granting Treasury loans. Furthermore penalties were imposed against those who in any way impeded the working of the Act.

The next step in housing legislation was the Artisans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act of 1874, which enabled public bodies to build proper houses for the working classes.[1] This was largely the work of Mr. Cross, the Home Secretary in Disraeli's Ministry, who was intimately identified with much of the reform legislation of that period. Mr. Ramsay Muir is authority for the statement that "the development of the social policy of Tory Democracy" during Disraeli's premiership between 1874 and 1880 "was entrusted in the main to Mr. Cross" whom he describes as a man "of real ability and wide sympathies."[2] In presenting the Artisans' Dwellings Act or the "Cross Act," by which term it was afterwards known, the Home Secretary said that the "public health should be the exclusive object to be

[1] *37 & 38 Vict.*, ch. 36.

[2] Ramsey Muir, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 593.

kept in view in any legislation dealing with this question" and that it was "the duty of a government to take care that the houses of the poorer classes should not become centers of disease and of conditions which propagate disease."[1] The operation of the Bill was limited to towns with a population of 25,000, or more. Local authorities on "the report of their medical officers" were empowered to clear out slum districts and undertake rebuilding and other improvements.[2] Mr. Chamberlain as Mayor of Birmingham was one of the first to take advantage of the Act. In 1876 he tore down the tenements and hovels which infested the center of the city and practically rebuilt the slum area. He is reputed to have said in 1875, while still a member of the Liberal party, that "the Artisans' Dwelling Act had done more for the town of Birmingham than had been done in the twenty preceding years of Liberal legislation."[3] In 1878 the measure was extended to Ireland so as to give urban authorities power to act.[4] In 1879 needed amendments were added which applied to housing in England.[5] In the same year a Public Works Loan Act was passed which permitted the granting of loans to societies for improving the dwellings of workers at a low rate of interest.[6]

The conditions of labour were still further improved by means of the Factory Act of 1874.[7] The continuous employment of women and young persons for more than four and a half hours was forbidden. The minimum age at which children could be employed was raised from eight to

[1] *Annual Register*, 1875, p. 43.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 44.
[3] *Campaign Guide*, 1914, p. 557.
[4] *41 & 42 Vict.*, ch. 52.
[5] *42 & 43 Vict.*, ch. 64.
[6] *42 & 43 Vict.*, ch. 77.
[7] *37 & 38 Vict.*, ch. 44.

ten years; and the working hours were reduced to fifty-six a week. Although the benefits of the measure were confined to women and children it indirectly affected many adults by reducing the hours of labour. The Act had the hearty support of Mr. Mundella, the Liberal M. P., who characterized it as a "noble measure." "It was to the immortal honour of the Conservatives," he said, "that they had passed the Factory Act." [1] In discussing the Act at another time he asserted that "the Conservative party had always been the friend of the toilers." [2]

In 1878 Mr. Cross succeeded in placing on the statute-book the comprehensive Factory and Workshop Consolidation Act.[3] Aided by a commission which had been appointed in 1876[4] he simplified and codified all previous factory legislation. Sixteen measures were repealed in their entirety as well as parts of others. This formidable Act fills more than fifty pages of the statute-book. Defects in previous bills were remedied and new features were added. It contained specific regulations with respect to sanitation, industrial accidents, dangerous machinery and industries, medical certificates of fitness for employment, over-time and night work, and more stringent rules for non-textile factories than had obtained before. The employment of those between ten and fourteen was limited to "half-time." A maximum of "fifty-six and a half hours work per week" for women in textile factories was fixed and "sixty hours in non-textile" industries. "All Saturdays and eight other days in the year" were to be regarded as half-holidays "while the whole of Christmas and Good-

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 119: 1463.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 218: 1769.

[3] *41 & 42 Vict.*, ch. 76.

[4] Hutchins and Harrison, *History of Factory Legislation* (London, 1911), p. 176.

Friday or two alternative days must be allowed as holidays." Stringent penalties were stipulated for failure to comply with the provisions of the Act and a practical system of inspection was inaugurated. This achievement of Mr. Cross was deservedly given "high praise" according to the impartial *Annual Register*.[1] One of those who lauded the measure was the Earl of Shaftesbury who said that "the people would bless the day when Sir Richard Cross was at the Home Office."

Another exhibition of Tory Democracy occurred at the very outset of Disraeli's administration when attention was given to an extension of the Truck Act with particular reference to the hosiery industry. This law[2] corrected abuses growing out of employers renting frames and machinery in which process the workers were badly mulcted.[3] The influence of Tory Democracy made itself felt in the Merchant Shipping Act of 1876.[4] This Unseaworthy Ships Act, as it is sometimes called, was designed to prevent overloading and to protect the lives of seamen. Indignant complaints had frequently been made that the lives of sailors were continually sacrificed to the greed of ship owners who overloaded their ships and sent them to sea in an unsafe condition. Because the vessels were heavily insured the owners were indifferent as to whether they floated or sank. Mr. Plimsoll, a Liberal M. P., for years had made every effort to interest Parliament and the public in the criminal loss of life caused by these overloaded and over-insured vessels. The Liberals however refused to carry out his wishes. On the afternoon that his Bill was abandoned (14 May 1873) he turned to the Conservative Whip and asked him for his

[1] *Annual Register*, 1878, p. 119.

[2] *37 & 38 Vict.*, ch. 48.

[3] George Howell, *Handy Book of the Labour Laws*, p. 194.

[4] *39 & 40 Vict.*, ch. 80.

support. It was readily granted. Mr. Plimsoll did not hesitate to speak his convictions as to the respective attitude of the two parties. In a speech before the House of Commons he declared:

> I am a Liberal of the Liberals. I have supported Liberal measures ever since I came into this House but it has been borne to my mind that the interests of the working-classes when at issue between themselves and capitalists are safer with the Conservatives than the Liberals. I suppose the working-classes of the country will not be slow in arriving at that conclusion.[1]

By the Act of 1876 every owner was required to mark distinctly the load line on his vessel, which became known in nautical parlance as the "Plimsoll" line. To obliterate or submerge this mark by overloading was a punishable offense. The Board of Trade was given power to detain unsafe ships. Rules calculated to discourage deck cargoes were incorporated in the Bill, as also were regulations to prevent the shifting of grain and all improper loading. Life-buoys, inextinguishable lights and a proper supply of signals of distress were other matters considered in the making of this law. Better conditions were imposed on passenger and emigrant ships. Shipping disasters in the future were to come under the surveillance of Wreck Commissioners. Various other precautions to safeguard those who go down to the sea in ships were provided for in the measure. "Although all Mr. Plimsoll's suggestions were not accepted," comments the *Annual Register,* "it may fairly be said that our Merchant Seamen now enjoy efficient and needful protection."[2]

Mr. Plimsoll, however, was not entirely satisfied and continued to agitate for still further improvements. In a letter to the Daily *Liverpool Post* he gave statistics which showed

[1] The *Times,* May 15, 1875, p. 6.

[2] *Annual Register,* 1876, p. 52.

that the loss of life in English ships was far greater than that of other European nations.[1] In 1884 some of the Conservatives urged the Liberals to proceed with new legislation which would make more effective the Plimsoll Act and thus reduce the loss of life at sea, which had been on the increase. Lord Randolph Churchill in a speech at Birmingham in 1884 maintained that the Liberals were slow to act because of "the angry growls of the ship owners." He further vouchsafed the information that his fellow Tory Democrat, Mr. Gorst, suggested to the Government that it might facilitate matters by taking "morning sittings but he was given to understand that he had better mind his own business." Because of "bargainings and negotiations carried on in secret at the Board of Trade" one-half of the Bill was abandoned according to Lord Randolph.[2] When the Conservatives were returned to power they amended the Shipping Acts in 1887,[3] and again in 1888.[4] These measures extended the requirements of life-saving devices. The Lloyd Signal Station Act of 1888[5] made needed provisions with respect to signal stations. The Customs Law Amendment Act which received the royal assent in 1887 protected seamen against "arbitrary imprisonment for contraventions of the customs laws for which they were not personally responsible."[6] In 1889 legislation making more stringent loading,

[1] *Liverpool Daily Post,* March 1, 1890, p. 7. The following figures were adduced in Mr. Plimsoll's letter:

Loss in English ships	1	in	66
Loss in German ships	1	in	123
Loss in Dutch ships	1	in	232
Loss in Norwegian ships	1	in	277
Loss in Italian ships	1	in	454

[2] The *Times,* April 16, 1884, p. 7.

[3] *50 & 51 Vict.,* ch. 62.

[4] *51 & 52 Vict.,* ch. 24.

[5] *51 & 52 Vict.,* ch. 29.

[6] *50 & 51 Vict.,* ch. 7.

pilot and wage requirements, improved still more the lot of seamen,[1] and in 1890 the provisions of the Act of 1876 as to the load-line, were amended for the purpose of removing certain ambiguities.[2] In 1892 the Merchant Shipping Act was again amended giving the authorities more specific power to condemn vessels as unsafe whose load-lines were submerged. The Bill required a more adequate supervision for inspecting the food and other supplies of crews who signed for the longer voyages.[3]

The interest of the Disraeli Ministry in education during their tenure of power was evidenced in 1876 by passing legislation so as to admit the principle of compulsory education, which required parents to provide for the instruction of their children. Provision was duly made for paying the fees of the children of poor parents.[4] Another measure passed in the same year placed co-operative societies on a more permanent and satisfactory basis. These societies were constituted as corporations. They could sue and be sued. They were privileged to engage in business and banking whereby workers were provided with convenient places for depositing their savings.[5] In 1874 other legislation dealing with co-operative institutions was duly enacted. The Building Societies Act corrected the anomalies growing out of previous legislation and placed these useful associations on a sounder basis.[6] Legislation which provided for the greater security and better management of the workers' savings was realized in the Friendly Savings

[1] *52 & 53 Vict.*, chs. 42, 46, 68, 73; *53 Vict.*, ch. 8.

[2] *53 Vict.*, ch. 8.

[3] *55 & 56 Vict.*, ch. 37.

[4] *39 & 40 Vict.*, ch. 79, p. 269.

[5] *39 & 40 Vict.*, ch. 45.

[6] *37 & 38 Vict.*, ch. 42.

Act of 1875.[1] An amendment to this Act was passed in 1876, with the result that many societies were placed in a much more favourable position than they had formerly enjoyed.[2] Mr. Mundella and Mr. Howell, in discussing social and economic progress during Queen Victoria's reign, are authority for the statement that "the value and importance of this legislation cannot be over-rated."[3] Other activities and efforts might be instanced as an earnest of Disraeli's determination to realize his policy of elevating "the condition of the people." Mr. Ramsay Muir in an impartial account of this period of social betterment states that "Disraeli enjoying real power for the first time in his long career had his chance of showing what were his conceptions of government and what was the meaning of the Tory Democracy which he had long preached."[4] The foregoing list of statutes reveals in a rather compelling fashion what that conception really was.

The Conservatives ceased to hold the reins of office in 1880 and when some five years later they returned to power under Lord Salisbury, their "internal policy was conducted on much the same lines as that of the Beaconsfield ministry of 1874-80."[5] It was during this period that Tory Democracy became more definitely crystalized and many political, social and economic improvements were advocated in its name and under its auspices. For a brief hour Lord Randolph Churchill was to dominate the scene.

A reform which Tory Democrats were desirous of accomplishing was that of remedying the sweating system.

[1] *38 & 39 Vict.*, ch. 60.

[2] *39 & 40 Vict.*, ch. 32.

[3] Ward, T. H., *The Reign of Queen Victoria* (London, 1887), p. 69.

[4] Ramsay Muir, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 593.

[5] Charles W. Oman, *England in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1923), p. 194.

Lord Randolph Churchill speaking at Paddington in 1888, declared that it was the business of the State to prevent this form of labour which violated all the principles of health and morality.[1] In the same year Lord Dunraven, who can quite properly be numbered among the Tory Democrats of his time, made a motion in the House of Lords with respect to this evil. His speech, which was based on a recent report of the Board of Trade, depicted the great waste of life and health which was involved in the clothing and other industries of East London where men and women worked many hours at a stretch under inhuman conditions in crowded and unsanitary rooms for a wage which was hardly sufficient to maintain a bare subsistence. He said "that no slaves were in so unhappy a condition materially as these free citizens of a free country."[2] Twenty years later another Tory Democrat, in the person of Mr. Alfred Lyttelton, was courageous enough to admit that to abolish sweating by establishing the minimum wage might mean the destruction of certain forms of industry. But it was better, he maintained, that these "industries should perish than that they should continue" under inhuman conditions.[3] While no legislation resulted, Lord Dunraven's pronouncement served to arouse public opinion and led to the appointment

[1] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. ii, p. 372.

[2] A similar opinion was expressed in caustic fashion by Lord Sydney Osborne who added that "at last some knowledge of the awful conditions of the East End and of provincial slums was penetrating an England which, with these horrors at its doors, went on subscribing half a million a year for foreign missions, spent its money lavishly on a Church House, and its time on a Pan-Anglican Conference of Bishops from all over the World." He denied that reform of this type of labour would drive trade out of the country and reminded his hearers that the same arguments had been used before against laws which had since proved beneficial. *Annual Register*, 1888, p. 42.

[3] Edith Lyttelton, *Alfred Lyttelton, His Life and Work* (London, 1917), p. 371.

of a competent select committee whose business it was to make a thorough investigation of the whole matter.[1] This committee, which was known as the Dunraven Committee, sat over a long period and examined many witnesses. It later reported that "sweating" had been practiced for fifty years and that the state of things which existed involved excessive hours of labour, unsanitary houses and a wage insufficient to meet the necessities of life.[2] But no real and effective remedial legislation materialized as a result of the report. Two decades later Mr. Lyttelton said that it seemed a mockery to have failed to make a move to cure this abuse during the intervening years.[3] Lord Dunraven in a mood of protest resigned from the Committee. He continued however to agitate in favour of the needed legislation. In a speech in Liverpool in 1890 he addressed himself to the problem and made some far-reaching proposals including the creation of a new department whose business it should be to look after the interests of the victims of this industrial evil.[4]

In the Factory and Workshop Act of 1891 [5] some slight effort was made to incorporate the recommendations of the Sweating Commission. This important measure, for which Mr. H. Matthews the Home Secretary was largely responsible, looked to the betterment of sanitation in factories and the improvement of operatives generally. The methods of inspection were changed so as to be more efficient. The Act provided for better security against fire; more equitable methods for testing the rate of payment for piece work; the limiting of women's hours to twelve with one and a half

[1] *Annual Register*, 1888, p. 42.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 4: 343.

[3] *Ibid.*, 5th series, vol. 4: 357.

[4] *Liverpool Daily Post*, January 7, 1890, p. 6.

[5] *54 & 55 Vict.*, ch. 75.

hours for meals. The legal age for the employing of children was changed from ten to eleven, which improvement affected 175,000 young persons.[1] Also, the evils of subcontracting and sweating were dealt with, but not at all adequately.

In 1897 the Unionists were responsible for another factory measure[2] which extended the scope of the Act of 1889. Various abuses were remedied by these Acts. That of 1889 more particularly had as its object the better protection of workers in cotton cloth factories.[3] The practical and serviceable Factory and Workshops Act of 1901[4] which was largely the work of the Unionist Home Secretary, Mr. C. T. Ritchie,[5] consolidated all previous factory laws and strengthened them. "It contained," as Mr. Asquith in a generous and non-partisan mood explained, "useful new developments of the factory law and also provisions facilitating the enforcement of the existing law."[6] The Act laid down specific rules respecting sanitation in factories and workshops, the number of people who could work in a prescribed space, and the fencing of moving machinery, the lack of which protection had been a prolific source of accidents and deaths. It contained regulations as to fire escapes, laundries, and the conduct of trades injurious to health, extending the list of such trades to docks, railway sidings and buildings in process of construction. Considerable attention and care were devoted to those clauses which had to do with the employment of women and children. A daily period of employment was prescribed and outside the limit of that

[1] *Annual Register*, 1891, pp. 62-63, 140-141.

[2] *60 & 61 Vict.*, ch. 68.

[3] *52 & 53 Vict.*, ch. 62.

[4] *I Edw. VII*, ch. 22.

[5] James F. Hope, *A History of the 1900 Parliament*, p. 267.

[6] *Annual Register*, 1901, p. 149.

period employment in factories and work-shops was illegal. These hours were confined to the daytime, thus ruling out all night work. Employers were required to make reasonable arrangements for meal periods. In a certain unhealthful type of establishments, such as print works, the maximum period of continuous employment was five hours. Observance of Christmas, Good Friday and every bank holiday was to be compulsory. Sunday work was expressly forbidden. Children, required by the law to attend school, could not be employed under any circumstances in factories and workshops. Many other minute regulations could be cited but enough has been noted to indicate the trend and nature of the Act.[1]

This piece of legislation which has been described as "the greatest and most important example of state interference in the interest of labour"[2] called forth expressions of appreciation from the Opposition as well as from those seated behind the Treasury Bench. Mr. Asquith characterized it as "the largest and most ambitious in its scope of any measure of the kind." "This is the last" he observed "or it may be destined to be the last of a series of enactments which have gradually raised the standard of health and safety which was spontaneously recognized and followed by the best and most humane employers of labour." Great Britain, he continued, owed a great deal to Lord Shaftesbury and those who had succeeded him for having rescued Great Britain from the danger of having a "stunted, sickly, ignorant" population.[3] Mr. Emmott, another Liberal, expressed the wish that the "Bill would be passed . . . and that it would do much good to those whom it was intended to serve,"[4] while the Liberal member for Berwickshire, Mr.

[1] *I Edw. VII*, ch. 22.

[2] John St. Loe Strachey, *Economics of the Hour* (London, 1923), p. 74.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 95: 631-641.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

Tennant, who was later to be the Secretary of the Board of Trade in Mr. Asquith's Ministry, likewise praised the measure. He congratulated Mr. Ritchie "on having introduced these proposals" which were largely in advance of anything which had come before Parliament in recent years.[1] Representatives of labour had the same sense of appreciation. Mr. C. W. Bowerman in his presidential address to the Trades Union Congress, at Swansea in 1901, said that "in all respects it was the most comprehensive work of the kind yet placed on the statute-book."[2]

A reform which was somewhat akin to the Factory Acts was legislation to alleviate the lot of shop assistants. Although a Bill dealing with this matter had been before Parliament in 1882[3] the first measure to become a law was the Unionist Shop Hours Regulation Act of 1886. It prohibited the employment in shops of young persons under eighteen years of age for more than seventy-four hours a week including meal times: if employed elsewhere the same time limitation was to obtain. This was a temporary measure but was made permanent by a Bill in 1892,[4] which included proper enforcement provisions. In 1897 the Unionist member, Sir John Lubbock, introduced a Shops (early closing) Act which provided for shorter hours and half holidays each week for shop assistants, but it failed to become a law. The Shop Assistants Act of 1899[5] was more successful. It required all shops employing "female assistants" to provide seats in the proportion of one to every three persons.

These measures, however, were more and more deemed

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 95: 631-641, p. 128.

[2] The *Times,* Sept. 4, 1901, p. 5.

[3] See the Earl of Shaftesbury's speech on this measure, *Parliamentary Debates,* 3rd series, vol. 266: 1824.

[4] *55 & 56 Vict.,* ch. 62.

[5] *62 & 63 Vict.,* ch. 21.

inadequate to deal with conditions which medical men said were having harmful effects upon thousands of workers. Consequently there was much agitation for a more comprehensive measure. Sir John Gorst voiced such a demand in 1903, after rising to second a motion for the early closing of shops, which it was contended would effect a more satisfactory remedy than any contained in past legislation. He referred to the fact that Lord Salisbury had placed himself on record as being favourable to the proposal which he was about to support. He complained of the extreme delay in effecting this reform. A remedial measure, he went on to say, had been introduced and debated in Parliament seventeen years before, but no legislation had resulted. "This case," he argued, "was a very fair example of the extreme slowness and difficulty with which social reforms were carried in this country." In 1888, he told his hearers, the President of the Royal College of Physicians and a President of the Royal College of Surgeons had pointed out to the House of Commons the great social danger of long shop hours particularly in the case of women. These unhealthful working conditions increased tuberculosis and rickets and had a disastrous effect on the succeeding generation, all of which, he added, contributed to the physical deterioration of the nation. The Liberals, he said, passed no remedial measures because they were too much concerned with Home Rule. When the Conservatives were elected in 1895 it was hoped that they would address themselves to the task. But eight years had gone by and "practically nothing was done."[1] Sir John Lubbock had tried to do something but "it was not until Sir John had been translated to the House of Lords that he was able" to do anything effective. This Bill had been referred to a select committee on which Lord

[1] Evidently Sir John Gorst had a poor opinion of the efficacy of the Bill passed in 1899.

Salisbury sat and he had used his influence in favour of its enactment. There was no doubt that the House of Lords would pass the legislation recommended by the committee and he hoped the Home Secretary would give some assurance that the lower House would do likewise.[1] It was not until the following year that the Shop Hours Act of 1904[2] embodying the recommendations of Lord Salisbury and his committee became a law. The Act empowered local authorities under certain conditions to effect the closing of shops early enough to assure the shorter working day.

Social legislation which the Conservatives regard with justifiable pride are the Mines Acts of 1886 and 1887. The former measure attempted to solve satisfactorily the vexed and chronic problem of check-weighing, and made a more considerate arrangement for the attendance of relatives at the inquests of deceased miners.[3] Its enactment was largely due to the efforts of Mr. Cross. It was, however, a limited piece of legislation when compared with the more comprehensive Mines Regulation Act of 1887[4] which embodied the recommendations of a Royal Commission that had been appointed by the Government in 1879. An exhaustive inquiry was conducted for several years. The statute which resulted consolidated all previous laws which had been passed for the protection of miners. It contained also many new features, including a provision whereby boys under twelve were forbidden to work either below or above ground. Safety and precautionary measures were strengthened so as to make less likely those accidents with which England has been all too familiar. Employers, agents and managers were made more liable for carelessness or neglect by facili-

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 118: 1456-1458.

[2] *4 Edw. VII*, ch. 31.

[3] *49 & 50 Vict.*, ch. 40.

[4] *50 & 51 Vict.*, ch. 58.

tating their prosecution in the courts. The Act naturally met the approval of the labour class. Mr. Burt, who described himself as a Liberal and Radical M. P., characterised it as "the greatest measure of the kind that had ever yet been passed by the British Parliament." [1]

In 1892 the Liberals introduced a Miners Eight Hour Bill which enjoyed the support of Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords and Mr. Chamberlain in the House of Commons. "I believe," said the Marquis of Salisbury, "that as a rule eight hours work is quite as much labour of the muscle or tension of the brain as an average man can give." [2] Mr. Chamberlain likewise urged the desirability of an eight hour day for the miners. When the objection was made that Parliament in passing such a bill would "dangerously" extend "the functions of the State" he replied that it was the State's duty to interfere when it could for the benefit of the community. "The State," he said, "was justified in doing anything which, in its ulterior consequences, added to the sum total of happiness." [3]

In 1892 Sir Matthew W. Ridley, the Conservative Home Secretary, was responsible for a measure amending the Coal Miners Regulation Act of 1887.[4] In the words of its author the Act endeavoured to "provide for the greater security of the men in the mines." It also provided for the representation of miners on arbitration councils. Mr. Asquith spoke in appreciation of this legislative effort, saying that "he was glad . . . that the Home Secretary had placed in the Bill a series of provisions which would have the effect of saving hundreds of lives which were at present exposed to avoidable danger in mines." [5]

[1] The *Scotsman*, Oct. 12, 1887, p. 10.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 2: 1559.

[3] *Annual Register*, 1892, p. 40.

[4] *59 & 60 Vict.*, ch. 43.

[5] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 42: 577.

An Act, raising the age of boys employed in mines from twelve to thirteen years of age, received the royal assent in 1900.[1] In the following year the Government made an effort to pass another Miners Eight Hour Bill. It was opposed on the ground that the iron, steel and coal interests would suffer. The Conservative sponsor of the measure urged its passage because of the injurious physical, mental and moral effects on boys employed for long hours in the mines. Although it passed the first readings it failed to become a law.[2] A similar Bill which was introduced in the following year prohibited the employment of youths under twenty-one for more than eight hours a day. Tory Democracy did not sufficiently prevail and it was defeated by a vote of 224 to 150.[3] Only one unimportant mining measure was enacted after 1900 by the Unionists. It was an amendment of the 1887 Act and had to do with the qualifications of managers.[4]

As to railway legislation Tory Democrats have exhibited the same attitude as in mining affairs. They supported the desirable Regulation of Railways Act (1889) which gave the Board of Trade some powers with respect to the overtime of railway workers. It provided also for an increase of safety devices on passenger trains.[5] The Salisbury Government appointed a commission to investigate the hours of labour by railway workers with the result that the substance of its recommendations was incorporated in the Railway Regulation Act of 1893 which was passed by the Liberals.[6]

In 1900 the Unionists placed on the statute-book the Rail-

[1] *63 & 64 Vict.*, ch. 21.

[2] *Annual Register*, 1901, p. 54-55.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1902, p. 95.

[4] *3 Edw. VII*, ch. 7.

[5] *52 & 53 Vict.*, ch. 57, sec. iv.

[6] *56 & 57 Vict.*, ch. 29.

way Employment (Prevention of Accidents) Act which empowered the Board of Trade to institute greater precautionary measures than had hitherto been possible. Rules and regulations were drawn up under authority of this Act and are known as the Prevention of Accidents Rules, 1902, (S. R. and O., 1902, No. 616).[1] Many lives among railway workers have been saved as a result of this measure.

Another industrial question which has commanded the interest of Tory Democracy is that of employers' liability toward their workmen in consequence of accidents sustained in the discharge of their duties. The first legislation dealing with the problem was the Employers' Liability Act of 1880[2] which was passed by the Liberals. The provisions of this Act were identical in principle with those proposed by the Disraeli Government in 1879.[3] Lord Randolph Churchill in a speech at Sutherland spoke favourably of the measure saying it was "well and wisely drawn and well conceived." But in the same address he qualified his approval by contending that it did not go far enough and was at fault because the parties involved could "contract themselves out of the operations of the Act." When the measure was before Parliament, Lord Randolph and his associates endeavoured to make it compulsory in its operation and more inclusive in its scope.[4] In this effort they received the cordial support of Mr. Knowles, the Conservative member for Wigan, who was a big employer of labour.[5] In striving to secure a truly adequate measure Lord Randolph allied himself with the more radical members of Mr. Gladstone's

[1] F. Tillyard, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

[2] *43 & 44 Vict.*, ch. 42.

[3] *Annual Register*, 1880, pp. 94-95.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 255: 241-243, 388-389.

[5] The *Times*, Oct. 21, 1887, p. 6.

party. He also, quite naturally, had the co-operation of his friends in the Fourth Party. Mr. Balfour at least on one occasion spoke in favour of extending the provisions of the Act.[1]

Mr. John Gorst was particularly active in his efforts to extend the Act to many classes of workers who were neglected in the proposed legislation because, as he remarked, "they had no votes."[2] The Bill, as introduced, he said on another occasion, "was intended to apply only to persons engaged in manual labour; domestic servants, clerks, timekeepers, watchmen, and other persons not actually engaged in manual labour though associated with manual labourers, being thrown over as a sop to the employers of labour. Their exclusion," he went on to say, "arose from the fact of their not being sufficiently powerful to induce the Government to include them in the Bill. . . . Those honourable members," he added, "with whom he generally acted, took a very independent view of the Bill; they did not represent any particular class or interest, but were contending for even-handed justice." Mr. Gorst then proposed an amendment which looked to the more adequate protection of the workers in the nation's arsenals and dock yards. He maintained that since the Government under the Merchant Shipping Act "was liable to pay compensations" to wealthy ship owners they should by the same token be liable for damages sustained by dock yard labourers. This, he said, "was a flagrant instance of applying one principle to the rich and another principle to the poor. If the dock yard labourers had been as powerful in that House as the ship owners they would have received consideration."[3] But the efforts of the Tory Democrats were futile. The *Times* in an editorial gave

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 255: 1492.

[2] *Ibid.*, 3rd series, vol. 255: 519.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. 255: 1479-1482.

Mr. Gladstone the credit for resisting and defeating their proposals.[1]

The generous and comprehensive legislation for which Tory Democrats fought in 1880 was realized in the Workmen's Compensation Act which received the royal assent 6 August 1897.[2] The most dangerous industries were at first included within the confines of the Act including mines, factories, railways, quarries, docks and engineering works. In the event of death from accident a sum equal to the worker's earnings for three years or the lump sum of 150 pounds sterling went to his dependants. When incapacity for work resulted a weekly payment of half the wages (such a weekly payment not to exceed one pound) was to be paid the disabled worker. Thus the employer became the compulsory insurer of all his employees against industrial accidents.

From the ranks of labour there was a veritable chorus of appreciation of the benefits conferred by this statute. Mr. G. W. Barnes, Labour Member in 1906 for the Blackfriars Division of Glasgow, described the Act as being "one of the best pieces of social legislation which has been placed on the statute-book in years."[3] Another Labour M. P., Mr. D. A. Thomas, in a speech to his constituents, expressed the opinion that "during the ten years he had the honour to represent them in Parliament he did not remember any other social reform in the House of Commons which equalled the Compensation Act in its value to the working-men of this country." He added that "he supported the Conservative Government in this particular matter and he made no apology for doing so."[4] Mr. Sam Woods, also a member

[1] The *Times*, Oct. 21, 1887, p. 6.

[2] *60 & 61 Vict.*, ch. 37.

[3] *Morning Post*, March 27, 1906, p. 6.

[4] *Daily Chronicle*, Aug. 6, 1898, p. 6.

of the Labour party, is quoted in the Liberal *Daily Chronicle* as saying that he had supported the Government Compensation Act because it was an excellent measure. "He did not think there was a man in the House of Commons who disagreed with the main principle of the Bill." [1] Mr. Parrott, the Yorkshire Miners' Agent, is reported by another Liberal journal, the *Daily News,* as having declared that "the Act was a great improvement on any Act of Parliament that had been passed in favour of the working-classes of this country," [2] while the Liberal M. P., Sir J. Joicey, in the House of Commons, said that in his opinion "no more important Bill had been introduced during the last fifty years." [3]

The Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897 was avowedly of an experimental and tentative nature. Mr. Balfour in 1900 explained to the House of Commons that its provisions were not broad enough and failed to give the workers adequate protection. A little later he said that he favoured its extension to the agricultural labourers.[4] Possibly an approaching election had something to do with these remarks. At any rate an Amending Act was presented to Parliament 2 February 1900,[5] and received the royal assent July 30, of the same year.[6] This piece of legislation, which caused a good deal of grumbling in certain quarters, extended the working of the 1897 Act to "agricultural labourers, casual workers and employers who habitually employed one or more workmen." [7] The original Act affected 6,000,000

[1] *Daily Chronicle,* Sept. 24, 1897.

[2] *Daily News,* Jan. 12, 1899, p. 7.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 49: 767.

[4] *Ibid.,* vol. 88: 426.

[5] *Ibid.,* vol. 78: 412.

[6] *63 & 64 Vict.,* ch. 22.

[7] *Annual Register,* 1900, pp. 140, 201.

persons. The 1900 Bill brought 1,700,000 additional workers under its beneficent operations.[1]

With the object of examining the defects of these statutes and still further extending their scope, the Unionist Home Secretary in November, 1903, appointed a Departmental Committee under the Chairmanship of Sir K. Digby.[2] The findings of this committee were incorporated in the Workmen's Compensation Bill which was passed by a Liberal Government in 1906.[3] The attitude of Tory Democracy towards this proposed measure was reflected in the following editorial opinion of the *Morning Post*. The writer expressed the view that the Unionists who had been responsible for the Act of 1897 should not "be backward" in giving a welcome to a Bill "which, while accepting and extending the important principles involved, eliminated some of the blemishes which experience has revealed in its detailed provisions. Nor will they regret that the present Liberal government should have gone boldly upon the lines indicated by the Unionist Government of 1897."[4]

Unemployment is another problem which has frequently engaged the attention of Tory Democrats. Lord Dunraven, in a speech at Liverpool in 1890, suggested the desirability of shortening the hours of labour as a means of reducing unemployment in times of industrial depression,[5] which plan in much more definite form was advocated in a Labour Party manifesto thirty years later. Sir John Gorst also ad-

[1] *Campaign Guide*, 1922, p. 616.

[2] *Hazell's Annual*, 1905, p. 310.

[3] *7 Edw. VII*, ch. 46.

[4] *Morning Post*, March 27, 1906, p. 6. The *Morning Post* during "a lucid interval" (as some one has described it), beginning with 1906, may fairly be regarded as an organ of Tory democratic principles. During this period its policy was determined by Sir Fabian Ware, an editor of progressive and democratic views.

[5] *Liverpool Daily Post*, Jan. 7, 1890, p. 6.

dressed himself to the problem in the course of a characteristic and lengthy discourse in the House of Commons in 1903. He referred to the fruitless commissions which had been appointed and after investigating the evil had rendered reports which no one acted upon. He spoke of the great harm effected by a certain deterioration and loss of skill on the part of workers because of unemployment. The securing of small holdings for the unemployed as was practiced in a certain Worcestershire community was suggested as a desirable remedy. He also thought that the local authorities should have more power delegated to them to deal with the matter.[1]

He gave expression to similar opinions in current periodicals. One such contribution appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* in 1903. He referred to the processions of unemployed in the streets of London and the seeking of alms which he said "was a disgrace to civilization." He protested because there was no effort to cure this economic disease in a fundamental manner. The remedies which had been tried in the past and were being suggested in 1903 were more likely to aggravate than to eradicate the evil which was at that time afflicting the body politic of England. He insisted that the whole industrial system needed overhauling. He maintained that "if the general condition of the people were sound the class of unemployed would cease to exist." The situation cried aloud for immediate action but none was forthcoming. The party should act at once inasmuch as "the happiness and welfare of the people have always been a vital article of the Tory Creed." The maintenance of the Constitution and the defense of the Empire never had a greater claim on the party than the well-being of the people. "Mr. Disraeli the great leader of Tory Democracy," he wrote, "always insisted upon social progress as the most

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 118: 319-325.

essential principle of his policy." He added that the Tory leaders seemed to have forgotten this and in the face of the great misery of 1903 arising from unemployment they displayed a regrettable apathy.[1]

This criticism of the Government's sloth was by no means confined to the pen and speeches of Sir John Gorst. The Labour members also assailed the inactivity of the Unionists who in turn pleaded that there had been lack of time to deal with the problem.[2] These misgivings and criticisms, however, were hardly justified by subsequent events. In gratifying contrast to the rather barren record of reform legislation following the South African war was the Unemployed Workmen's Act of 1905 which Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, M. P., described as "one of the most courageous pieces of statesmanship of our generation."[3] Mr. Keir Hardie once referred to it as "the only Act passed by any Government dealing systematically with unemployment since the reign of Elizabeth."[4] And Mr. W. Crooks, another Labour M. P., said a year after its enactment that "many and many a home had been kept which would have been broken up today but for that Act."[5]

This measure, which was largely the work of Mr. Walter Long, provided for "labour exchanges and unemployment registries" which were to help men find work and aid them to emigrate. The financial clauses permitted the levying of taxes for effecting the project to which Parliament would make certain grants. Voluntary local "distress committees" were expected to carry out the scheme.[6]

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, 1903 (vol. 53), pp. 519-533.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 150: 1013-1014.

[3] The *Times*, Jan. 31, 1908, p. 8.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 194: 1648.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. 161: 441.

[6] *Annual Register*, 1905, pp. 134-135.

In the meantime the tariff reformers were putting forth the claim that their policy, if adopted, would provide industrial prosperity and thus eliminate unemployment. Mr. Chamberlain's fiscal programme was more and more advocated in the party literature but, with a few exceptions, it did not command the support of the Tory Democrats.

Legislation favourably affecting Co-operative and Friendly Societies, which had been passed by the Disraeli Government, was given similar consideration during Lord Salisbury's premiership by two amending Acts—one in 1887 [1] and another in 1889.[2] A measure designed for the benefit of the small depositors in Post Office saving banks was enacted in 1887.[3] Also in the same year an Act which looked to the better protection of depositors in saving banks was placed on the statute-book.[4] Additional legislation was enacted in 1891 [5] and again in 1904.[6] Two comprehensive measures were passed in 1896 one of which was the Friendly Societies Act [7] and the other was the Collecting Societies and Industrial Assurance Companies Act which amended and consolidated much previous legislation.[8] In 1898 another Act received the royal assent which facilitated the borrowing capacity of Friendly Societies,[9] and in 1902 a Bill was duly passed which protected employees from interference on the part of their employers with respect to participating in the benefits of the societies and their funds.[10]

[1] *50 & 51 Vict.*, ch. 56.
[2] *52 & 53 Vict.*, ch. 22.
[3] *50 & 51 Vict.*, ch. 40.
[4] *50 & 51 Vict.*, ch. 47.
[5] *54 & 55 Vict.*, ch. 21.
[6] *4 Edw. VII*, ch. 88.
[7] *59 & 60 Vict.*, ch. 25.
[8] *59 & 60 Vict.*, ch. 26.
[9] *61 & 62 Vict.*, ch. 15.
[10] *2 Edw. VII*, ch. 21.

The Truck Amendment Act of 1887 [1] served to increase the scope of another Disraelian reform. This piece of legislation revised and extended previous enactments. The Act of 1896 afforded additional protection to employees against any unfair deductions from their wages because of poor and careless work. In certain mills and railways the system of fines disappeared as a result of this measure.[2]

Legislation looking to industrial peace, which had found expression in the Conciliation Act of 1867,[3] was extended in the Conciliation (Trades Disputes) Act of 1896,[4] which, in turn, introduced a method of settling labour disputes through the Board of Trade by means of arbitration. The Board of Trade was empowered to inquire into the cause of a given dispute, to bring the contending parties together for the purpose of effecting an amicable settlement and to appoint a conciliator at the request of either party. The registration of private boards of conciliation and arbitration was provided for and the Board of Trade was authorized to form such boards where none existed. That the measure did not entirely fail of its purpose may be seen in the comments of Mr. John Burns who in a speech at Battersea in January, 1897, said: "there were many causes which had led to the reduction of the number of strikes and among the chief was the Conciliation Act which the present Government had passed." [5] Because the Board of Trade was not accorded powers of compulsion the Act did not function in the larger industrial disputes. Nor were the local authorities given adequate powers. However, from August, 1896,

[1] *50 & 51 Vict.*, ch. 46.

[2] *Campaign Guide* (1922 ed.), p. 635.

[3] *30 & 31 Vict.*, ch. 105.

[4] *59 & 60 Vict.*, ch. 38.

[5] The *Standard*, Jan. 4, 1897, p. 3.

to 30 June 1903, one hundred and fifty-four cases were amicably settled through the agencies set up by this measure.[1]

The fruitage of Tory Democracy is discernible in legislation granting a greater degree of local self-government. The members of the Fourth Party frequently insisted that one of the chief obstacles in the way of effective reform consisted in the bureaucratic tendencies which accompany a highly centralized form of government. A "genuinely popular form of local government" was one of the essential demands set forth by Lord Randolph Churchill in his Dartford programme. Sir John Gorst was an insistent advocate of the same idea. The virtue of democratic local government was almost a fetish with him. Social reforms, he said, do not originate in the public departments of the Government. The civil service had a deadening effect on progressive and humanitarian impulses. Nor were heads of departments apt to stimulate their subordinates with much zeal for better conditions. The machinery of government, in his opinion, was inherently opposed to innovations and changes. It was likewise useless to expect very much from Parliament. A private member, according to Gorst, had little chance of getting a bill passed. The laws are made, he declared, "as in Russia by the determination of officials and not as it used to be by the consent of the representatives of the people." What then, he asked, is the best method to secure necessary remedial legislation? It is best, he contended, to look to the local authorities and place upon them "the responsibility for the social welfare of the people and to confer upon them the necessary powers" for effective action. That, he insisted, was the policy of Disraeli with respect to health legislation. It was necessary to abandon the idea of a benevolent central government which was able to accomplish everything. He thought that it was much

[1] *Hazell's Annual*, 1905, p. 309.

better to make each county and municipal authority "absolutely and entirely responsible for the health and welfare of its own men, women and children." [1]

Although the Conservatives failed to adopt all of Sir John Gorst's suggestions there was placed on the statute-book one important piece of legislation which embodied the principle he had so consistently advocated throughout his long political career. That was the Local Government Act of 1888 which has been pronounced "one of the best measures ever carried." [2] This Bill, which was the work of Mr. Ritchie, replaced the venerable and aristocratic form of county government with bodies elected by popular vote, thus extending the representative principle. Sixty-two administrative counties were created together with sixty county boroughs which consisted of cities with over fifty thousand inhabitants. In each of these units the elected councils performed the administrative duties which hitherto had been exercised by the justices at Quarter Sessions. The Act permitted a very large amount of responsibility and work to be delegated to committees. But the council retained sole power of expenditures and assumed a general supervision over the committees so as to prevent duplication of effort and wasteful appropriations.[3] In 1902 and 1903 the duties of the School Boards were transferred to the councils, an arrangement which Sir John Gorst frequently advocated.[4]

Lord Randolph Churchill seemed to have been hopeful of having the principle of local option included in the Act of 1888,[5] a desire, which was shared by its author. Mr. Ritchie in drawing up his measure "proposed to vest the

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, 1903 (vol. 53), pp. 519-529.

[2] H. Paul, *History of Modern England*, vol. v, p. 203.

[3] *Annual Register*, 1888, pp. 84-86.

[4] See his speeches in Parliament: *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 109: 1472-1475; vol. 122: 1821.

[5] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. ii, p. 77.

powers of licensing in Committees of the County Councils." His plan, however, met with such opposition that it had to be abandoned.[1] Lord Salisbury was anything but friendly to the proposal. In a speech at Newport, a few years earlier, he expressed the view that when " the number of non-thirsty souls exceeds the number of thirsty souls " and decided that " the thirsty souls shall have nothing at all to drink," a situation was created which seemed to be an infringement " upon the elementary liberties of mankind." [2]

Lord Randolph Churchill did not live to see any results of his efforts to effect changes in the licensing system. In 1896, the year following his death, a Royal Commission was appointed to examine the subject. As a result of its report [3] two Acts were passed. The Licensing Act of 1902 [4] protects the wife or husband of an habitual drunkard and provides for the registration of clubs. In 1903 the provisions of this Bill were extended to Scotland.[5] The Act of 1904 provided for the reduction of unnecessary licenses and the public control of future licenses.[6]

Among the many subjects which engaged the interest of Lord Randolph Churchill was that of land reform and allotments. It found a place, for instance, in the famous Dartford speech,[7] and was a conspicious feature of the Churchillian programme as outlined in the *Pall Mall Gazette*.[8] Land reform was aided by the Allotment Act of 1887 [9]

[1] *The Licensing Question* (London, 1904), p. 5.

[2] *The Conservative Programme* (pamphlet containing speech of Marquis of Salisbury), (London, 1885).

[3] C. 9379 (Command Papers).

[4] *2 Edw. VII*, ch. 28.

[5] *3 Edw. VII*, ch. 25.

[6] *4 Edw. VII*, ch. 23.

[7] *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches*, vol. ii, p. 74.

[8] *Pall Mall Gazette* (extra no. 31), Dec., 1886, p. 6.

[9] *50 & 51 Vict.*, ch. 48.

which made transfer of land less difficult with the result that there was an increase of over 100,000 allotments between 1887 and 1892. This Act gave the sanitary authority —the Town Council in urban and the Rural District Council in rural districts—the power to facilitate the acquisition of land for the small agriculturist. A minor bill, favourable to allotment holders, was passed in 1891.[1] The Glebe Lands Act of 1888[2] provided for the sale of Church lands and their "acquisition by local authorities for allotments." In 1891 another beneficial Allotment Act received the royal assent.[3] In 1892 the Conservatives were responsible for the Small Holdings Act[4] which authorized the important County Councils to borrow money so as to acquire land and in turn dispose of it to small agriculturists. To facilitate the transaction in necessitous cases, power was given the County Councils to advance four-fifths of the purchase price to prospective tenants. The Land Transfer Act of 1897 made the transfer of land easier[5] and the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1900 allowed a tenant on giving up his holding, compensation for improvements.[6] On 5 October 1900, Mr. Balfour in a speech delivered at Edinburgh expressed a desire for legislation which would still further increase the number of small land owners.[7] But during the ensuing years this and other reforms were subordinated to the more ambitious schemes of imperialism.

[1] *54 & 55 Vict.*, ch. 33.
[2] *51 & 52 Vict.*, ch. 20.
[3] *54 & 55 Vict.*, ch. 33.
[4] *55 & 56 Vict.*, ch. 31.
[5] *60 & 61 Vict.*, ch. 65.
[6] *63 & 64 Vict.*, ch. 50.
[7] *National Unionist Leaflet*, no. 1472, p. 23.

CHAPTER VI

The Fruitage of Tory Democracy (continued)

To claim much fruitage for Tory Democracy in connection with the Irish problem may seem like a gratuitous assumption. While it is true that in the past Conservatives have resisted Home Rule and Irish demands for greater political freedom, they have, on the other hand, been responsible for much valuable land legislation and other economic reforms. As for the Tory Democrats they have more than once raised their voices in behalf of a greater degree of justice for Ireland. They have on occasion denounced Dublin Castle and all its ways. "It is a nest of corruption", Lord Randolph Churchill once told an interviewer of the *Pall Mall Gazette,* and when next your paper "wants a new sensation it could not do a better public service than by telling us 'The Truth about Dublin Castle'." [1] And no follower of Mr. Parnell or John Redmond ever denounced the Conservative Irish policy with more vituperative bitterness than did Lord Randolph in his vehement "Piggott" speech. This attitude of fair play was quite in keeping with Disraeli's behest to revert "to the benignant policy of Charles I" and avoid that of Cromwell and "forget two centuries of political conduct for which Toryism is not responsible." [2]

Within more recent years advanced Tories have been quite as frank and generous as Lord Randolph Churchill in expressing their views on the Irish problem. During the

[1] *Pall Mall Gazette,* Nov. 27, 1884, p. 2.

[2] Monypenny and Buckle, *op. cit.,* vol. ii, p. 190.

unhappy days of turmoil which followed the World War no more vigorous condemnation of the methods pursued by Sir Hamar Greenwood was to be heard than that of Tory Democrats like Lord Henry Cavendish, Mr. Oswald Moseley and even Lord Robert Cecil. Furthermore, it is well to remember that a Unionist Lord Chancellor [1] was one of the most active and conspicuous figures in negotiating the treaty which accorded to the Irish Free State the status of a Dominion; a solution which had been advocated by Lord Robert Cecil [2] as early as 1919.

Ignoring the official attitude of the Conservative or Unionist party towards Irish aspirations for political self-determination (which by no stretch of the imagination can be regarded as friendly, much less democratic), let us consider those activities which have been actuated by the spirit of Tory Democracy. When the Conservatives came into office in 1874 they found in operation two coercion Acts of great severity. They at once proceeded to repeal some of the most objectionable provisions of this legislation. The Habeas Corpus Act, for instance, which had been suspended, was restored. The result of this policy was soon noticeable in the considerable reduction of agrarian outrages.[3] During the administration of Gladstone after the elections of 1880, the Tory Democrats, actuated no doubt by political as well as more laudable motives, protested against those activities of the government which they considered prejudicial to the welfare of the Irish people. In 1882 they attacked the policy of repression which the Liberals were then engaged

[1] Viscount Birkenhead, who at the time was identified with the Coalition Government.

[1] Viscount Birkenhead, who at the time was a member of the Coali- therefore suggest that we should offer to the people of Ireland the same kind of a constitution as our dominions at present possess."

[3] John Morley, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 338.

in.[1] In 1885 when the Salisbury Government assumed office, partly because of political considerations of a selfish nature, they refused to renew the expiring Crimes Act. Lord Randolph Churchill was to a large extent responsible for this display of moderation and conciliation. During the brief tenure of office by the Conservatives in 1885 they placed on the statute-book the Ashbourne Act [2] by which the Government set aside five million pounds sterling for the purpose of extending loans to those Irish tenants who desired to purchase their own holdings. This "courageous experiment",[3] as it has been called, permitted the prospective purchaser to borrow the entire amount of capital required at a rate of 4 per cent. The debt was to be repaid by annual instalments spread over a period of forty-nine years.

In 1887 Mr. Balfour was made Chief Secretary for Ireland. This was a notoriously troubled period in Irish affairs and the new Chief Secretary pursued a policy which won for him the unfortunate name of "Bloody Balfour". Despite this Cromwellian title and his new Crimes Bill, which contained all the harsh features of previous coercion legislation, efforts were made to enact laws designed to solve some of the country's agrarian problems and to promote its economic welfare. The plan which he had in mind was twofold: namely the use of strict repressive measures until peace had been restored and then the adoption of the reform measures deemed necessary to remove the cause of agitation and unrest. "I shall be as relentless as Cromwell," he said, "in enforcing obedience to the law, but at the same time I shall be as radical as any reformer in redressing grievances and especially in removing every cause of complaint in re-

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd Series, vol. 262:532.

[2] *48 & 49 Vict.*, ch. 73.

[3] Low and Sanders, *The Political History of England*, (London and New York, 1913), p. 369.

gard to the land." [1] His plan was adequate save in that it disregarded entirely the spiritual element in the Home Rule agitation—a quality which did not appeal to his coldly brilliant temperament.

Among the remedial measures passed during Mr. Balfour's régime was the Land Purchase Act of 1887 which mitigated one of the worst grievances of the unfortunate Irish tenantry.[2] In 1888 Mr. Balfour introduced a Bill which was designed to reform the land courts.[3] Lease holders, by its provisions, were entitled to obtain a judicial revision of their rents. The Bill, however, failed to command the entire support of Lord Randolph Churchill who complained that it was inadequate. He expressed the hope that more effective legislation dealing with the machinery of land litigation would be enacted later.[4]

The Light Railways Act [5] was a better instance of Mr. Balfour's "policy of material betterment" in that it greatly improved the means of communication and made more readily accessible localities which had formerly been isolated. It was this Act which did most "to entitle him to the gratitude of the Irish peasant." [6] In 1890 and 1891, following a visit to Ireland, Mr. Balfour put forth efforts which resulted in another Land Purchase Act [7] whereby the Government aided tenants to acquire their holdings from the landlords by advancing money at a low rate of interest. Stock was issued by the Imperial Government for that purpose to

[1] E. T. Raymond, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

[2] *50 & 51 Vict.*, ch. 33.

[3] *51 & 52 Vict.*, ch. 13.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 324:373-377.

[5] *52 & 53 Vict.*, ch. 66.

[6] *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. xii, p. 86.

[7] *54 & 55 Vict.*, ch. 48. This Bill was introduced 24 March 1890. See *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 342:1696-1720.

the amount of some twenty-three million pounds sterling. This Act, which Mr. Balfour's biographer says was the "legislative fruit of much hard thinking" (and he might have added of some previous training in the school of Tory Democracy),[1] evoked appreciative praise from both Mr. Parnell and Mr. Redmond. "It will enormously benefit the Irish tenant-farmer," declared the former, "and it will greatly benefit the Irish labourers." Mr. Parnell was so favourably impressed by many features of the Bill that he referred to its author with just a touch of irony, although with much satisfaction, as "our most recent recruit and disciple". Mr. Redmond also extolled the Act, characterizing it as a great measure.[2] This Bill brought into existence the Congested Districts Board which had the happy result of securing the co-operation of Irishmen with the British authorities in bettering housing conditions. Considerable sums of money from the Irish Church fund were placed at the disposal of the newly created board. A report which was issued by this body after an investigation, revealed a shocking state of affairs among the urban as well as country districts and proposed remedies which later had a partial fulfilment.[4]

Following the general election of 1895, in which the Unionists were successful, a dozen or more Irish remedial measures were enacted. The first of these was The Purchase of Land Amendment Act of 1895, which better enabled evicted tenants to buy their former holdings.[5] The

[1] In his speech introducing the measure Mr. Balfour stated that he had been much interested in the subject when he sat below the gangway in 1883. *Parl. Debates,* vol. 342:1096.

[2] *Parl. Debates,* 3rd series, vol. 343:981.

[3] E. T. Raymond, *op. cit.,* p. 78.

[4] *Ibid.,* pp. 78-79.

[5] *58 & 59 Vict.,* ch. iv.

Land Law Act which received the royal assent 14 August 1896, made payments by the small land owner less onerous by extending the period of payment from forty-nine to seventy years. Certain financial powers were also granted the Congested Districts Board.[1] In 1897, Mr. Gerald Balfour in behalf of the Unionists offered a Land Law (Ireland) Bill which contained many features of Mr. Morley's measure of 1896. The object of this proposed legislation was to facilitate the working of the various land-purchase measures which had been enacted in the past.[2] In the following year the same Unionist member offered a Bill for establishing a Departmental Board which was to have for its object the promoting of agriculture and the other industries of Ireland.[3] Although these proposals failed of immediate enactment they were duly incorporated in subsequent legislation.

More adequate local self-government for Ireland had always been the eager and insistent demand of Lord Randolph Churchill. In 1888 he devoted two of his most important speeches to a consideration of this question.[4] Ten years later there was enacted the Local Government Bill[5] which embodied many of the principles for which he had contended. The system of local self-government by setting up county councils, which had been granted to England and Wales, was extended to Ireland in the Bill. Mr. John Redmond said of this measure, which did much to revivify Irish society, that nothing he could say "would exaggerate" its

[1] *59 & 60 Vict.*, ch. 47.

[2] *Hazell's Annual*, 1897, p. 597.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1898, p. 599.

[4] In Birmingham 9 April, 1888. See Birmingham *Daily Post*, April 10, 1888, p. 7. Also in Parliament 25 April 1888. See *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. ii, p. 332.

[5] *61 & 62 Vict.*, ch. 37.

value. For the first time in Irish history, he added, the people were made free in every county.[1]

Lord Randolph Churchill when at the height of his influence had advocated large expenditures of money on scientific education and public works for the purpose of developing the latent wealth of Ireland. This, he said, would engross the thought and activities of the people and so prove to be "an immediate and enormous measure of pacification."[2] Some years later his idea was carried out in a rather meagre fashion by three measures. The Agricultural and Technical Instruction Act[3] of 1899 which created a Department of Agriculture and made some provision for developing the agricultural and other resources by means of scientific education, was one effort in this direction. The Marine Act of 1902[4] facilitated the building of piers and harbours and otherwise improving the coast line of the poorer localities. The Ireland Development Grant Act of 1903[5] set aside a considerable sum of money for educational purposes and economic projects for improving the condition of the people.

Although no less than forty-two land acts for Ireland[6] had been passed, the Unionists knew, as did all the world, that the problem was far from solved. Inspired by a desire to make it possible for the peasant to become the owner of his holdings more readily and easily, the Balfour Government passed the Irish Land Act of 1903, which has been described as "the most comprehensive of its kind ever presented to Parliament."[7] It was a bold scheme of state-aided

[1] The *Times*, Oct. 11, 1898, p. 5.

[2] *Pall Mall Gazette*, Nov. 27, 1884, p. 2.

[3] *62 & 63 Vict.*, ch. 50.

[4] *2 Edw. VII*, ch. 24.

[5] *3 Edw. VII*, ch. 23.

[6] W. T. Stead in the *Review or Reviews* (New York) 1903, (vol, 27), p. 577.

[7] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 32, p. 1091.

land purchase which materially reduced the financial burden of the tenant and resulted in greatly increased land sales.[1] Mr. Wyndham, the Irish Secretary, who for some time had been conscious of the defects of past legislation, was the author of the measure and with his name it is generally associated. At the same time it owed much of its success to the support it derived from Mr. Balfour who encouraged his friend Mr. Wyndham to undertake this advanced piece of legislation. Lord Dunraven also gave his friendly aid and interest. In the Cabinet it was opposed by Mr. Chamberlain, the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Lansdowne and Lord Londonderry. The main objections which were raised had to do with the big financial outlay involved. During the ten years following the enactment of the measure, more than eighty-three million pounds sterling were expended, all of which was advanced by the Government with the exception of an amount slightly exceeding half a million pounds sterling. More than 253,000 persons took advantage of the benefits of the Act between 1903 and 1913 and thus became the owners of their own farms.[2] Mr. Redmond in speaking of the results of this legislation, said: "the landlords had recognized that their days of ascendancy had gone forever, and the tenants had recognized that the indefinite continuation of land war would bring about the industrial ruin of the country." He explained, with evident satisfaction, that the compromise which had been arrived at, enabled the tenants to purchase their holdings at "a fair price", and that "the difference between the sum which the tenants should be expected to pay, and the sum which the landlords would accept, was to be made good by the State." [3]

[1] For an account of this Act and its history see Mr. John Redmond's speech: *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 125:1323-1329.

[2] *Estates Commissioners Report,* 1912-1913, Cd. 7145.

[3] *Annual Register,* 1903, p. 31-32.

Legislation in behalf of the Irish labourers was enacted by the Conservatives in 1885, 1891, 1892 and in 1896. The Wyndham Act of 1903 took cognizance of their needs and empowered the Land Commission to look into the matter of better housing conditions. In 1905 a Bill was introduced "which involved the compulsory acquisition of land and the building of cottages."[1] In addition to land legislation and other efforts looking to the economic betterment of the Irish people, Mr. Balfour and Mr. Wyndham also endeavoured to bring about the administrative reform of Dublin Castle. But "the Ulster Tories took alarm" and frustrated such well-intentioned plans.[2]

Along with the Irish question, education has been the subject of bitter controversial strife, particularly during the opening years of the twentieth century. The record of the Conservative party with respect to this question has not been altogether discreditable. Much favourable and helpful legislation testifies to the influence of Tory Democracy. Unfortunately the whole subject has been confused and beclouded by the spirit of sectarianism. The attitude of the Conservative party has been essentially Tory in its concern for the prerogatives of the Established Church but it has also evinced a desire to improve the condition of the people by means of increased educational facilities. The Conservatives gave their support to the important Education Act of 1870 as Mr. Forster, its sponsor, freely admitted. Mr. Disraeli certainly believed in the movement and in 1876 his Government passed the Elementary Education Act which required every parent to provide for the education of his child.[3]

Lord Randolph Churchill advocated more generous edu-

[1] *Hazell's Annual*, 1905, p. 671.

[2] *Nineteenth Century*, 1906 (vol. 59), p. 179.

[3] *39 & 40.*, ch. 79.

cational provisions for all classes. To bring education "freely to every child in England," he once declared to be the "truest kind of Conservative legislation." [1] Lord Dunraven during a speech at Liverpool in 1890 gave expression to a similar opinion. He also urged the necessity for more leisure and opportunity for study and self-improvement for adults, thus anticipating the adult education movement of a later day under the leadership of Mr. Alfred Mansbridge. The well-being of the nation, he once asserted, demanded an educated citizenry. Since England had a government by the people it was imperative that they should have the intelligence to act with wisdom and judgment respecting the questions which were presented to them as voters. He declared that "the only thing the Tory party had to dread was ignorance. From a party point of view it was of the very first importance that those who had political power in their hands should have sufficient leisure to instruct themselves." [2]

In the same year that Lord Dunraven made his Liverpool speech the Conservative Government effected a sweeping reform by means of the Education Code of 1890.[3] Payment on the basis of results in individual examinations was abolished and a fixed grant per scholar for each efficient school was put in its place. Aid for poor schools was provided. Drawing, cooking and other subjects in domestic science were encouraged. Free education was achieved by the Education Act of 1891 [4] which one authority had described as "the great legislative achievement of the year." [5] The Act of 1891 provided that all schools which abolished their fees

[1] The *Times*, Oct. 21, 1887, p. 6.

[2] *Liverpool Daily Post*, Jan. 7, 1890, p. 6.

[3] *53 & 54 Vict.*, ch. 22.

[4] *54 & 55 Vict.*, ch. 50.

[5] H. Paul, *op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 218.

were to receive a special grant. The results of this legislation have exceeded all anticipations as to its effectiveness. Other educational legislation enacted at this time included the Technical Instruction Act which empowered School Boards to give technical instruction or organize technical schools.[1]

While the Conservatives were in office from 1895 to 1906 they passed more than twenty acts dealing with education. Sir John Gorst, who was the Education Minister in the House of Commons,[2] was associated with much of this legislation.

In 1896 Gorst was putting forth every effort to have the Government accept an educational measure which had cost him much labour. His plans, however, failed to meet with the approval of the party chiefs. In the following year the Voluntary Schools Act (1897) was passed.[3] It contained many of the features which had originally appeared in the Bill which was rejected the year before. In explaining this measure Sir John stated that its main purpose was to establish in every county and borough "a paramount educational authority", which authority was vested in the County Council. One of the provisions of the Act had to do with the vexed question of religious instruction. The managers of elementary schools, if they desired a government appropriation, were obliged to make arrangements for giving such instruction, provided a "reasonable" number of parents so desired. The statute also raised the age of

[1] *52 & 53 Vict.*, ch. 76.

[2] His official title was Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education. His superior was the Lord President of the Council who as a rule left the educational duties of the office to the Vice-President. Lowell says "the relation of these two ministers to one another .... was always somewhat undetermined." (A. L. Lowell, *The Government of England*, vol. ii, p. 331.)

[3] *60 & 61 Vict.*, ch. 5.

compulsory attendance from eleven to twelve years and provided for special financial grants in cases of necessity. The Elementary Education Act of 1897,[1] another measure in which Sir John Gorst was interested, provided for financial assistance to Board Schools which were located in the poorer districts. In 1898 the Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act [2] received the royal assent as did also the University of London Act [3] which provided for teachers' training courses. In 1899 the Board of Education Act [4] was passed regarding which the *Daily Chronicle* (Liberal) said that it represented "the first successful attempt ever made in this country to incorporate and knit together in one harmonious whole the disconnected parts that went to make up the sum total of English education." The same paper called it "the charter of national education".[5] This Act, as may be inferred from the comment of the *Daily Chronicle,* was largely concerned with departmental machinery. Prior to 1899 education in England was mainly the result of personal initiative supplemented by sporadic efforts on the part of the State to introduce a little order here and there, and fill up the worst gaps and deficiencies with various improvised measures that were not always in organic connection with the rest. Elementary education, for instance, was not properly connected with secondary schools. "In no department of English Government," says James F. Hope, M. P., "had the anomalies been so great as in that of education or the practical working so seriously embarrassed." [6] The Act

[1] *60 & 61 Vict.*, ch. 16.

[2] *61 & 62 Vict.*, ch. 57.

[3] *61 & 62 Vict.*, ch. 62.

[4] *62 & 63 Vict.*, ch. 33.

[5] *Daily Chronicle,* Aug. 9, 1899, p. 3.

[6] James F. Hope, *A History of the 1900 Parliament,* (London, 1908), p. 150.

of 1899 did away with these anomalies. It introduced order and economy, and eliminated friction and overlapping. "The whole system of Education was made intelligent," observes the *Daily Chronicle* in the article already mentioned. It may be added that Sir John Gorst was responsible for much of this reform.

Other measures enacted during this period were The Elementary Education (School Attendance) Act of 1899[1] which raised the age at which school attendance was required, and the Elementary Education Act of 1900[2] which provided for improved administrative machinery. In 1900 the so-called "Cockerton judgment" placed in jeopardy a large number of schools and evening classes. The Education Act of 1901[3] made possible the continuance of this valuable work.

The widely discussed Education Act of 1902[4] around which was waged a long and acrimonious controversy was the most comprehensive and useful of all the Unionist educational measures. In the words of a National Unionist leaflet it "linked together the different grades of education and provided a ladder from elementary school to University for the clever child of the poorest parent."[5] One of the principal objects of the Act was to promote secondary education, which heretofore had been neglected almost entirely by the authorities. Above all, it created a more efficient educational system throughout the nation. The many public bodies dealing with instruction were replaced by one in each county or large town. Prior to 1902 there were 3300 edu-

[1] *62 & 63 Vict.*, ch. 13.

[2] *63 & 64 Vict.*, ch. 53.

[3] *1 Edw. VII*, ch. 11.

[4] *2 Edw. VII*, ch. 42.

[5] *National Unionist Leaflet*, no. 1339, p. 6.

cational authorities. After this much-needed consolidation was effected, there were 328 authorities, who were empowered to deal with every phase of education — elementary, technical and secondary. The principle of local management, for which Sir John Gorst had long contended, was incorporated in the measure. As he explained,[1] the people were enabled to "form their own plans of education." In Manchester, for example, the plan of education would be a Manchester plan. The people of that city could decide as to the type of schools to be established and decide where the schools were to be located. The people, he said, would "have exactly the kind of school best adapted to their locality." Some of the practical benefits which resulted from the Act of 1902 were better qualified teachers, higher standards, improved equipment and better buildings for the non-provided schools.

Although this was Mr. Balfour's own pet measure, Sir John Gorst had much to do with its turbulent career. It frequently was his task to justify the Bill before the onslaught of the Non-Conformist members of the House of Commons. That part of the measure which was subject to the most violent attacks concerned the proposal to support the voluntary or denominational schools from local rates without subjecting them to control by the elected authorities. Such an arrangement, it was contended, was a discrimination in favour of the Established Church since their schools received public funds, and at the same time retained the privilege of private management. Another mooted question was the type of religious instruction given in the church schools. Sir John Gorst insisted that the teaching was not dogmatic. He quoted numerous instances from his extensive experience to show how non-sectarian this instruction was. The difficulty, he said, existed on the platform and in Parliament

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 107:672.

rather than in the schools.[1] His own attitude, as indicated by his speeches a few years later, was at once liberal and tolerant. Personally he seemed to be favourable to the system used in some of the Colonies and the United States where the work of State schools was restricted to secular education. But public opinion in England, he observed, was not ready for such an experiment.[2] Since some form of religious training was demanded he felt that the pupil should have that "kind of religious instruction which was acceptable to its parents."[3]

Despite the Non-Conformist opposition at the time of its enactment the statute proved to be so practical and workable that it continued to function until the Education Act of 1918 was passed. After its efficiency was demonstrated none were so willing to do it justice as the Liberals themselves. Mr. J. A. Pease, the Liberal Minister of Education, speaking in the House of Commons, said: "Many of us have thought that there were serious defects in the Act of 1902, but no one who compares the position of to-day with what it was ten years ago can deny that a very great advance has been made in the education of the country."[4] Lord Haldane, the Liberal Lord Chancellor, in a speech at Manchester in 1913, remarked with his customary independence of judgment, that there could "be no doubt as to the success of the Act of 1902."[5] Mr. A. G. C. Harvey, another Liberal, speaking in the House of Commons, in 1907, declared that "the Act of 1902 had had the effect of improving elementary education by raising the salaries of the teachers and by

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 107:678; vol. 113:990-998, 1432-1433; vol. 115:426-427.

[2] *Ibid.,* vol. 131:1042.

[3] *Ibid.,* vol. 138:186.

[4] *Ibid.,* 5th series, vol. 55:1909.

[5] *Manchester Guardian,* Jan. 11, 1913, p. 10.

stimulating public interest in education."[1] These views were shared by Mr. J. Thomas, one of the Labour members in the House of Commons who said it had been "clearly demonstrated" that the Act had benefited the education of the country. "As a general result," he declared, "the standard of education" had improved.[2]

The Unionists next placed on the statute-book the Education (London) Act of 1903 which extended to London the provisions of the Act of 1902 with some special adaptations. The principle of local control was a conspicuous item in its content, to the great satisfaction of Sir John Gorst.[3] The Act, furthermore, provided for the inclusion of women among the managers, which arrangement was also favoured by Sir John Gorst.[4]

Not all of Sir John's ideas, however, were accepted by the Government. His Tory Democracy had become more pronounced than ever and he was in a chronic state of protest because of the limited programme of his party with respect to educational matters as well as other reforms during the period following the Boer war. Mr. Justin McCarthy, who described him at this time as "one of the foremost men in the present Government and in the whole Tory party" (a somewhat exaggerated estimate), indicated that he was exceedingly dissatisfied and restive under the restraint which was imposed by the party leaders on his more advanced and progressive plans.[5] He was impatient of delay. He felt a real concern regarding the lack of educational advantages for the masses. Writing in 1902 he insisted that unless re-

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 178:90.

[2] The *Standard,* July 24, 1913, p. 7.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 125:605.

[4] *Ibid.,* vol. 125:714.

[5] The *Independent* (vol. 53), p. 2152.

forms were initiated at once the people of England would be less instructed than those of other European countries. He expressed the opinion that the British would suffer in any commercial rivalry during the future as a result of backwardness in education. In such a contest the "uninstructed nations," he wrote, would "have to reconcile themselves to be menial servants to the rest of the world and to perform the lower and rougher operations of modern industry." Neglect in this field was a national peril and immediate and drastic steps should be taken by the authorities to remedy the situation which he believed was most serious.[1]

He was critical of the Government because they did not extend to Ireland the educational reforms which had been granted England in 1902. Speaking in the House of Commons, he declared that the Irish system of education was antiquated. It was unfortunate, in his opinion, that it was under the control of Parliament. He insisted that it ought to be under popular control.[2] "That would be a part of self-government in Ireland which everybody would be only too glad to bestow," he remarked on another occasion. He expressed the hope that the Government "would soon introduce a measure of that kind."[3]

Sir John Gorst was particularly interested in the welfare of the poorer children and the responsibility of the school and other public authorities for their physical well-being as well as their intellectual training. In fact his concern for the children of the poorer classes became the dominant passion of his later career. This was a Tory legacy derived from Sadler and Oastler rather than from Disraeli. He was a twentieth-century Shaftesbury. He attempted to do for the ill-fed school children of England during the first decade

[1] *Living Age*, 1902 (vol. 235), p. 321.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 131:414.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. 131:1297.

of the twentieth century what Shaftesbury did for the unfortunate factory children in the nineteenth century. "A valiant champion of the children," one writer has described him—ever eager to "promote their physical, moral and intellectual welfare." [1] In an address as President of the Educational Association for the Advancement of Science at its meeting in Glasgow in 1901 he made a plea for the "deserted children, destitute orphans and children whose parents" belonged to the criminal and pauper classes. He maintained that it was the duty of the State to care for these unfortunates. To neglect them constituted a future menace. He argued in favour of the government undertaking to supply the place of the home where such an influence was lacking. "Homes and schools," he said, were "cheaper than prisons and workhouses." [2] Children, he maintained, in one of his numerous magazine articles on the subject, had inalienable rights. If the parents were unable to perform properly their duties it then became the duty of society to "step into the breach . . . and perform the duty for them." [3] He also protested against the practice of sending destitute children to industrial schools where they received no adequate preparation or training. There was also, he said, much need for a better supervision of vagrant children. He pointed out that the Local Government Board had been addressed by county councils, quarter sessions and boards of guardians who had emphasized the seriousness of this problem. Legislation giving local authorities the required power to deal with the evil was recommended. In any event, he was confident that there should be an official inquiry.[4]

[1] *Westminster Review,* 1895 (vol. 144), p. 333.

[2] *Popular Science Monthly,* 1901 (vol. 60), p. 50.

[3] *Living Age,* 1905 (vol. 246), p. 231.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 135:646-648.

The plight of children whose widowed mothers were without resources was the subject of one of Sir John Gorst's speeches in the House of Commons. He commented unfavourably on the futile and expensive system which sent the mothers to the workhouse and committed the children "to district schools or otherwise dealt with them at great cost by the guardians." A more satisfactory and less costly system would permit the authorities to pay the mother for the support of the children. Thus the family would be kept together. But since widows were not voters he presumed their situation would receive scant attention. Twenty years later Mr. Baldwin, the Conservative Premier, announced such a reform as part of the programme of his party.

Another innovation which Sir John Gorst advocated in connection with the elementary educational system was the effecting of some arrangement whereby underfed school children should receive needed attention at the hand of the State.[1] But his appeal at the time was given scant consideration by the leaders of his party.

Among the many reforms which have commanded the interest of Tory Democracy, the health of the people has had a foremost consideration. The burden of *Sanitas sanitatum* seemed to weigh heavily on its conscience. Although no very comprehensive measure such as the Insurance Act of 1911 is to be credited to the Conservative party, there were numerous minor measures and valuable housing acts which were intended to protect and improve the health of the population. In 1887 a Pure Food Act[2] was passed which exemplified the principle laid down by the Disraeli Government in 1875 and 1879. In the same year legislation which extended the provisions of the Metropolitan Open Spaces Act

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 133:782.

[2] *50 & 51 Vict.*, ch. 29.

to the provinces and Ireland received the royal assent.[1] In 1888 the English Public Health Acts were amended [2] and in the following year another Food Act was placed on the statute-book.[3] About this same time a measure was enacted which dealt more effectively with infectious diseases.[4] In 1890 the Open Spaces Acts in England and Ireland were further extended.[5] A list of other health measures which were enacted during the course of the same year (1890) included a Bill providing for more sanitary barracks; [6] an Act for the dealing with infectious diseases; [7] an important amendment to the English Public Health Acts [8] and a measure providing for the improvement of hospitals in Scotland.[9] The year 1891 saw the passage into law of an Act which provided for the establishment of gymnasiums and museums in the cities of England; [10] and the Scottish Public Health Act was amended for the purpose of improving the water supply in certain districts.[11] An important Bill consolidating and extending the health laws of London also received the royal assent during the same year.[12] In 1892 the Alkali . . . Works Regulation Act was amended with a view to better safeguarding the public health.[13] In 1896 the

[1] *50 & 51 Vict.*, ch. 32.
[2] *51 & 52 Vict.*, ch. 52.
[3] *52 Vict.*, ch. 10.
[4] *52 & 53 Vict.*, ch. 72.
[5] *53 & 54 Vict.*, ch. 25.
[6] *53 & 54 Vict.*, ch. 25.
[7] *53 & 54 Vict.*, ch. 34.
[8] *53 & 54 Vict.*, ch. 59.
[9] *53 & 54 Vict.*, ch. 20.
[10] *54 & 55 Vict.*, ch. 22.
[11] *54 & 55 Vict.*, ch. 52.
[12] *54 & 55 Vict.*, ch. 76.
[13] *55 & 56 Vict.*, ch. 30.

Unionists placed on the statute-book a law which planned to cope more effectively with epidemics and infectious diseases,[1] and in the following year another Bill of a similar nature was enacted.[2] The Public Health (Scotland) Act of 1897 consolidated and codified the existing laws which had to do with sanitation,[3] and in 1899 another Sale of Foods and Drug Act was passed which gave the Local Government Board more effective powers in dealing with the importation and sale of adulterated and injurious foods.[4]

No reform is more vitally connected with the health of the people than that of adequate and suitable housing.[5] Lord Randolph Churchill in his speeches frequently referred to that fact, remarking on one occasion that many of the physical evils of the nation as well as much of its crime and misery could be traced to bad housing conditions.[6] Lord Salisbury also displayed a personal interest in housing reform, having been instrumental in securing the appointment of a Royal Commission in 1884 which made a thorough investigation of the whole problem.[7] The presence of the Prince of Wales on this Commission was an earnest of the general public concern in the question.

Mr. Balfour was particularly interested in the subject and was active in promoting housing legislation of a progressive type. In March, 1884 when introducing the Dwellings in Crowded Districts Bill he said "that he brought forward this question in no party spirit." He added that it would "be an exhibition of almost criminal perverseness to try and

[1] *59 & 60 Vict.*, ch. 19.

[2] *60 & 61 Vict.*, ch. 31.

[3] *60 & 61 Vict.*, ch. 38.

[4] *62 & 63 Vict.*, ch. 51.

[5] For an account of housing reform during Disraeli's time, *cf. supra*, pp. 176-178.

[6] *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, vol. ii, p. 372.

[7] The *Times*, July 25, 1884, p. 6.

extract party capital out of a question which was, in some respects, the most difficult, complicated, and delicate that Parliament had ever had to deal with." Neither was it his intention to approach the matter "from a sentimental point of view." He realized that it would be easy to excite the pity and even the disgust of members by citing conditions as they existed within a few steps of where they were in session. But he believed that enough had been done to arouse the emotional interest of the public. The task which confronted them was to direct that emotion along a useful and remedial channel. They should approach the question, he remarked, "as physicians rather than as rhetoricians." He then proceeded to quote a pamphlet which showed how better housing conditions in Glasgow had lowered the death rate in that city and had improved the general health of its population. After stating that the problem could not be satisfactorily dealt with by sanitary legislation or commercial enterprise he proposed that the Public Works Loan Commission should aid such bodies as were able and willing to carry on the work he recommended. He might be told that, in making such a proposal, he was promoting socialism; that it was no business of the State to provide cheap lodgings, and that it would be just as absurd for the Government to provide cheap bread. He replied to this objection by saying that those "advocates of non-intervention were very one-sided. They objected to the State interfering with the question of housing the poor." But such intervention, he said, was to be seen in London, and in "all the large towns". By State interference they "made large streets and new railways, and cleared districts of unsanitary houses." Mr. Balfour again turned the attention of the House to conditions in Glasgow. The authorities of that city, he observed, had achieved a great and lasting betterment in certain areas. The people in those areas, he went on to say, lived now in

much more sanitary homes. Not only was their health better but their morals were better. That, he said, was the net result of State action. This question, he added, did not merely concern the present generation but that of posterity as well. If the English race of the future was to maintain its best traditions, immediate action, in his opinion, was imperative.[1]

The Conservative party at that time formed the Opposition. In July, 1885, after they had assumed office, Lord Salisbury initiated legislation which was designed to carry out the recommendations of the Housing Commission which he had helped bring into existence. In the House of Lords on the occasion of the second reading of the Bill he made an earnest plea in its behalf. He remarked that he was mindful of the fact that many of his hearers as owners of land and houses would be affected by the proposed measure. But he assured them that it contained nothing prejudicial to their best interests. Like Mr. Balfour, he pointed out that the strength and prosperity of England depended on the health and well-being of the masses and that nothing was more essential to that health and well-being than good housing. He also reminded his colleagues that they were the trustees for the more unfortunate members of society and so should do all in their power to alleviate their hard lot in life, a sentiment which shows that Lord Salisbury, on occasion, could exhibit the spirit of Tory Democracy.[2]

These efforts of the Conservative leaders, who received the support not only of their own followers but of the Liberals as well, resulted in the passing of the Housing of the Working Class Act of 1885.[3] The Act empowered the Local Government Board to "pull down buildings unfit for

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 3rd series, vol. 285:510-519.

[2] *Ibid.,* vol. 299:897.

[3] *48 & 49 Vict.,* ch. 79.

human habitation." Landlords were forbidden to let their houses in an unsanitary or unfit condition. Should illness or death result from the occupancy of a house because of its condition the owner was liable for damages suffered by the tenant. Sanitary authorities were given the right to make such by-laws as would render effective the inspection of lodging houses. Power was granted the Metropolitan Board to acquire the sites of disused prisons for the erection of working-class dwellings to be let at a low rent. The scope of the Act extended throughout the whole country, thus making it possible for the erection of buildings for agricultural labourers as well as for the urban artisans.[1]

The Bill, during its Parliamentary career, was assailed by individualists like the Earls of Wemyss and Milltown because "of the sanction of socialism" which it contained.[2] Lord Bramwell likewise denounced it "as an advance towards State socialism." [3] As a matter of fact, in the light of recent British legislation, the measure was far from extreme. But in 1885 it represented a rather advanced conception of State activity. The Act when put in operation succeeded in gradually reconstructing the worst slum areas.

The Royal Commission which was appointed in 1884 continued its labours after the passing of the Act of 1885. Its final report was "a fairly drastic document," and found its more complete expression in the Housing Act of 1890.[4] The first part of this measure re-enacted and consolidated previous legislation. It provided in a more effective and comprehensive manner for the clearing of tenement areas and the extension of large improvement schemes. The second part provided for the compulsory purchase and re-

[1] *Annual Register*, 1885, p. 121.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1885, p. 121.

[3] Low and Sanders, *op. cit.*, p. 369.

[4] *53 & 54 Vict.*, ch. 70.

construction of unhealthy houses and clearing of small areas: the third part provided for the compulsory purchase of land and building of new workmen's dwellings irrespective of any clearance scheme. The powers given by the second and third parts were to be exercised by town and urban Districts Councils.

In 1897 The Congested Districts (Scotland) Act became law.[1] About the same time the second reading of a Working Men's Dwelling Act was moved by Sir A. Hickman, a Conservative. It enabled local authorities at their discretion to lend money to workingmen not to exceed one hundred and fifty pounds sterling to facilitate the purchase of a house in which a workman resided—the workman to provide one-fourth of the sum to be spent. The measure readily passed through all its stages in the House of Lords where it was supported by the Marquis of Salisbury. In the following year (1899) it received the royal assent.[2] In 1900 another housing measure was enacted which still further amended the Act of 1890.[3] It was criticised by the Opposition because it was not sufficiently comprehensive.[4] This, in turn, drew from Mr. Balfour a spirited reply in which he referred to the housing resolution he had offered in 1884, since which time, he told the House, he had "taken a profound interest in the question of housing of the working-classes." He expressed the opinion that the solution of the problem might well be facilitated in the future by the increase of cheap transportation to areas located within reasonable distance of the industrial centers. Not only railways and tramways might easily make these suburban districts accessible, but also "great highways constructed for motor traffic" which

[1] *60 & 61 Vict.*, ch. 53.

[2] *62 & 63 Vict.*, ch. 44.

[3] *63 & 64 Vict.*, ch. 59.

[4] *Annual Register*, 1900, pp. 116-117.

would have "the immense advantage of taking workingmen from door to door which no tram or railway could do." In reply to the taunt that the proposals of his party at that time were lacking in completeness, he referred to the policy of inaction which had characterized the Liberals with respect to the housing problem. He presumed that the entire lack of legislation by the Liberal party was due to the fact that "a complete and exhaustive" scheme was being contemplated by them. Consequently it was left to the Derby-Disraeli Government in 1867 to pass the Torrens Act, "which, though not a complete and exhaustive measure was one which did some good." He observed further, that nothing was done by the Liberals while they were in office between 1868 and 1874. During the years 1874-1880 the Conservative Government were in control of affairs and passed the Cross Acts in 1875 and in 1879. From 1880 to 1885 while the Liberals were in office nothing happened in the way of housing reform. Mr. Balfour then referred to the Conservative Housing Act of 1890 and the Public Health Act of the same year and the benefits which they conferred on the people.[1]

By the Act of 1900 [2] local authorities were enabled to buy land for the erection of workmen's dwellings either within or outside their respective areas. It might be noted that the London City Council promptly availed themselves of the powers granted in this Act, by purchasing an estate at Norbury just outside the county boundary.

The next move made by the Unionists in dealing with the housing question was in 1901. The *Annual Register* informs the reader that on April 2 of that year "the Housing Committee brought forward a scheme for building operations on a very extensive scale." Parliament took action

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 83:518-519.

[2] *63 & 64 Vict.*, ch. 59.

and passed legislation which provided for the purchase of land at Tottenham and the erection thereon of cottages "which were to be rented within the means of classes earning less than 30 shillings a week." [1]

In August, 1902, a Joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament, which had been appointed to investigate the further housing needs of the workers, made a report containing many practical recommendations. But the Government failed to give serious consideration to these proposals, being content with adding a minor amendment to the Act of 1890. The Unionists, during the years following the conflict in South Africa, became indifferent to this and other needed reforms. Housing legislation was now neglected. "The Unionist leaders of the Tory Democracy," as Sir John Gorst wrote in one of the prominent magazines in 1903, had become recreant to their obligations.[2]

[1] *Annual Register,* 1901, pp. 96-97.

[2] *Nineteenth Century,* 1903 (vol. 53), pp. 519-533.

CHAPTER VII

Later Phases of Tory Democracy

"All present-day Conservatives, except those most bigoted, are Tory Democrats, principally by conviction, but partly by necessity, for they know that they could not hold power by merely 'conserving' the institutions of the country." E. G. Knollys, in the *Nineteenth Century*, Dec. 1922, p. 904.

It is not without significance that during the years which immediately preceded the Unionist debacle in the General Election of 1906, Tory Democracy was at a low ebb. The party leaders were quite destitute of the spirit which had characterized Mr. Disraeli or Lord Randolph Churchill in the preceding century. Reforms which were urgently demanded were thrust into the background and imperialism was in the ascendant.

This reactionary trend of the party was recognized by Mr. Sidney Low as early as 1902. Writing in the *Nineteenth Century* he called attention to the fact that the progressive and vitalizing contribution made by Pitt, Peel, Disraeli, and Lord Randolph Churchill, was lacking.[1] The party was

[1] It is worthy of note that similar criticisms of the party were made by progressive Tories in 1924. Leslie H. Lang in an article entitled "The Young Conservative" declared that many of the younger members of his party applauded a communication, which had recently appeared in the *Times*, by Lord Bledisloe, containing the following admonition: "If some of the stimulating idealism, the courage and above all the vision of Disraeli could but inspire our leaders . . . . there would be unprecedented opportunities for the beneficent work of a once great party." *National Review*, March, 1924, pp. 73-74. In the *Spectator* of Aug. 2, 1924, no less than four vigorous articles reflected much the same temper. See the *Spectator* Aug. 2, 1924, pp. 149, 152, 158-159, 163-164.

"waiting for a new Elisha" to formulate "the new aims" which were "restlessly turning in the minds of men". It was imperative that this leader should realize that the time had "come to order a forward movement". By the same token it would be necessary to see the futility of dwelling too much upon the past. He would have to understand that great political and social problems were "not to be solved by the constant repetition" of respectable watchwords. Nor was the whole of statesmanship "summed up in Unionism and Imperialism." He protested against reforms being continually blocked by the cry that the Union was in danger or "that the Empire had to be maintained." The younger and more active Tories, in his opinion, were tired of continually hearing that formula and wanted a "reconstructive policy for the people" living in the British Isles "and for the Union and Empire as well."[1] The desired type of leadership, however, failed to emerge and during the years following the war in South Africa the Ministry of 1902-05 remained singularly indifferent to the needs of the hour. This condition of affairs was a contributing factor in determining the electorate in the early part of 1906 to return the Liberals to power with a mandate to inaugurate remedial legislation which had been neglected too long by the Unionists. It is equally significant that in this same election fifty-one Labourites were successful candidates.

One of the reforms to which the Liberals addressed themselves, after assuming office, was that of old-age pensions which had been advocated in the past by the more advanced Unionists but which had been neglected by the leaders. The taunt had been made, as Mr. Bonar Law admitted in one of his speeches, that the Unionists promised old-age pensions and the Liberals granted them,[2] which was another way of

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, 1902 (vol. 52), p. 682-683.

[2] The *Times*, Dec. 17, 1912, p. 8.

saying that the Tory Democrats were responsible for promoting a reform that the party failed to carry out. The Liberals reaped where the Tory Democrats had sown. It was fruitage which rightly belonged to official Conservatism but was left ungathered until another party, urged by the zeal of Lloyd George, seized it in the eventful reform year of 1908. In fact Mr. Lloyd George appropriated more than one page from the book of Tory Democracy. It so happened that in 1899 he sat on a Tory committee, presided over by Mr. Henry Chaplin, which made a study of the whole question of old-age pensions.[1] The committee, which in its proceedings reflected the spirit of Tory Democracy, reported in favour of a scheme which formed the basis of the Lloyd George Act which was passed in 1908.

Other instances could be quoted to show how intimately Tory Democracy has been identified with the origin and furtherance of this Act, which Mr. Bonar Law maintained had its genesis in the activities of his party.[2] One of the first voices to be raised in behalf of such a scheme was that of Sir John Gorst. In a speech delivered 10 November 1891, he advocated state insurance of workers against sickness, accident or incapacity to earn a livelihood because of old age. As a Conservative, he said that he hoped this reform would be accomplished.[3] In the following year, during the campaign of 1892, Mr. Balfour in his election address committed himself to the same proposal.[4] Some years later in the course of a speech at Ipswich he declared that old-age pensions had been first recommended by Mr. Chamberlain.

[1] R. H. Gretton, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 135.

[2] The *Times*, Dec. 17, 1912, p. 8.

[3] *Daily Graphic*, Nov. 11, 1891, p. 3.

[4] E. T. Raymond, *Life of Arthur Balfour*, p. 85.

One account of the inception of the movement which resulted in the Act of 1908 goes back to a paper read by Mr. Charles Booth before the Statistical Society in December, 1891. "It is characteristic of the Liberal paralysis of the times," says Mr. Gretton, "that within twenty-four hours of that paper being read Mr. Chamberlain was adopting the subject as an urgent piece of domestic reform and that no prominent Liberal seized upon it."[1] That much credit is due to Mr. Chamberlain in preparing the public mind for this measure is quite generally admitted. Mr. Lloyd George once remarked that "the statesman who on the whole had done more to popularize the question of the old-age pensions in" England than any one else was "the member for West Birmingham" (Mr. Chamberlain).[2] Lord Wolverhampton, a prominent Liberal who served in the Cabinets of Lord Rosebery and Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, has given expression to the same opinion.[3] An examination of Mr. Chamberlain's utterances on the platform[4] and in the periodicals of the day[5] fully substantiates these testimonials.[6] Not only did he endeavour to arouse the public but he used his influence in persuading Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour that they could not afford to be indifferent to the matter. Consequently when the Unionists were installed in office after the election of 1895 it was determined that it should be one of the first measures to be taken up by the Government.

In 1896 a committee was appointed to examine the problem. Two years later the Rothschild Committee, as it was

[1] R. H. Gretton, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 304.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 190:566.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. 192:1336.

[4] *Annual Register*, 1892, p. 154.

[5] See for example *Nineteenth Century*, 1892 (vol. 32), pp. 677-710.

[6] For an outline of Mr. Chamberlain's old-age pensions proposals see the *Spectator*, 1895 (vol. 74), p. 9.

called, submitted a report [1] which, however, was not of a character to encourage the Government to take action.[2] But the Tory leaders continued in an insistent mood and in 1899 appointed the excellent Chaplin Committee to consider the whole subject anew. Its report revealed the ugly fact that nearly one-half of the working population were unable to make provision for their old age and were therefore dependant upon the rates at or about the age of sixty-five. In the case of the agricultural labourers, the unskilled workers and the lower wage-earners, two out of three of those over sixty-five at some time or other received the rates. The committee which had been appointed for the purpose of examining the comparative merits of various old-age pension bills which had been introduced in Parliament, turned away from these proposals and pronounced in favour of a plan approximating the one used in Denmark. Any British subject sixty-five years of age, who had not been convicted of a penal offense within the previous twenty years and whose income was less than ten shillings a week and who had endeavoured to make provision for himself and failed, was to be granted a pension of not less than five or more than ten shillings a week.[3]

Although several bills followed upon the heels of the Chaplin report there was no sign of immediate legislation. According to the *Annual Register* "it was generally understood that the committee had been appointed to postpone rather than to hasten discussion of a thorny question."[4] The "thorny question" to which the *Annual Register* referred had to do with the financial aspects of aid for the aged poor. A Departmental Committee which was ap-

[1] Cd. 8911 of 1898.

[2] *Annual Register*, 1898, p. 125-126.

[3] *House of Commons Paper*, no. 296 of 1899.

[4] *Annual Register*, 1899, p. 169.

pointed to examine this phase of the proposed reform estimated that the total immediate annual cost would be "ten million pounds sterling: rising to fifteen million pounds sterling in twenty years." [1]

In the meantime Mr. Chaplin's Tory democratic report had aroused a great deal of interest and discussion. It had been widely circulated and there was earnest expectation that party pledges respecting it would be fulfilled. With the failure to act, much recrimination ensued. Mr. Sidney Low expressed the view that the party would stultify itself if it failed to enact legislation in view of Mr. Chaplin's report with its practical recommendations. He warned the Conservatives that if they did not "wish the whole subject to be dealt with at some future time, perhaps on hazardous lines, by a Radical ministry, they should face the difficulties," and adequately respond to the obvious demands of the situation.[2]

What then, in the light of these facts, is the explanation of the party's failure to enact a satisfactory old-age pension law? Sir John Gorst would maintain that it was because the ideals of Disraeli and Churchill had fled from the councils of the party. During the years just prior to the elections of 1906 he was constantly bemoaning the fact that the Unionists had exchanged the legacy of Disraeli for a mess of pottage—meaning by a mess of pottage the South African adventure and Mr. Chamberlain's fiscal programme. Mr. Bonar Law in his speech of 17 December 1912, to which reference has already been made, faced the question quite frankly. The South African war, he said, was responsible. When reminded that two years had elapsed "between the end of the war" and the exit of the Conservatives from office, he further explained that the disorganization of the national

[1] *House of Commons Paper*, no. 276 of 1903.

[2] *Nineteenth Century*, 1902 (vol. 52), p. 695.

finances because of the war had rendered the undertaking impossible.[1] "The preoccupation of the Boer war, the task of settlement in South Africa, the problem of Imperial defense, the anxiety of foreign affairs all tended," explained the *Times*, "to cause social questions to be neglected."[2] Other reasons might be instanced including the fact that Mr. Chamberlain had turned his attention from the cause of social reform to that of tariff reform. The energies of the Unionists were being spent, either in furthering Mr. Chamberlain's schemes, or in disputes among themselves as to the adoption of his fiscal programme which to some of the Tory Democrats, at least, was anathema.[3] A Unionist

[1] The *Times*, Dec. 17, 1912, p. 8.

[2] *Ibid.*, Feb. 9, 1907, p. 11.

[3] A curious feature of this controversy was that the tariff reform element claimed Tory Democracy for its own. One of the Party's catch-phrases during the election campaign of 1906 was: "Tariff Reform means Social Reform." The best way to help the worker was through the higher wages and the more regular employment which he would enjoy when Mr. Chamberlain's plan was adopted. This view was entertained by Lord Milner. (See *Speeches and Addresses by Viscount Milner*, pp. 244-246). Articles appearing in the *Nineteenth Century* (vol. 61, p. 417 and vol. 63, p. 354) claimed that Lord Randolph Churchill had been favourable to Mr. Chamberlain's scheme. See *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill* (vol. i, p. 297) where he says: Free trade had "diminished employment in agricultural districts." But a little later he stated that he did not want to influence his hearers "directly or indirectly" on the subject of protection. On the other hand in his Stockton address he flatly declared: "It is no use saying to me . . . . 'Go to America or New South Wales.' I will not go to America and I will not go to New South Wales. There is not the smallest analogy between these countries and England. America is a self contained country and almost everything she requires for her people she can produce in abundance. We cannot. We have more people than we can feed; and not only for food but for our manufactures we depend on raw material imported from abroad." (*Churchill's Speeches*, vol. ii, p. 265.) In a speech at Sunderland he said: "The main reason why I do not join myself with the Protectionists is that I believe that low prices of the necessaries of life and political stability under democratic institutions are practically insep-

contributor to the *Fortnightly Review* explains his party's inaction by saying that the Balfour Government had "relapsed into a state of moral limpness when its energies should have been usefully employed in dealing with old-age pensions" and other reforms.[1]

Among the various reforms which needed urgent attention but which were neglected by the Unionists during the period following the Boer war, were those which had to do with the evils revealed in the report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration. This committee was appointed in the autumn of 1903 by the Duke of Devonshire, the Unionist President of the Council, as a result of the alleged physical deterioration of certain classes of the population. During the progress of the war in South Africa alarming reports became current regarding the large number of volunteers for the army who were rejected as physically unfit. In Manchester 8000 out of 12,000 were found to be incapable of service. Only 1200 were fit in every respect. In St. George's Barracks, London, according to the recruiting statistics of 1902, 12,951 young men submitted themselves for enlistment and were accepted, but 4,841, or 37.4 per cent, were afterward rejected as being unfit. At the Hounslow Barracks 1,625 offered themselves for enlistment in the army and 642 were rejected, or 39.5 per cent. At the Newcastle-on-Tyne recruiting depot 2,012 offered themselves and 766 were rejected, or 38.1 per cent. Going over to Ireland, at Belfast there were 1,443 inspec-

arable and that high prices of the necessaries of life and political instability under democratic institutions are also inseparable." *Ibid.*, p. 228. But one of Lord Randolph's Tory democratic friends, Mr. Louis J. Jennings, M. P., advocated protection as early as 1886. See his speech in the House of Commons. (*Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 305:1058). Lord Dunraven was also in favour of protection at this early date.

[1] *Fortnightly Review*, 1913 (vol. 100), p. 44.

tions for enlistment and 542 rejections, or 37.6 per cent. These statistics together with published articles by General Sir Frederick Maurice and by Sir William Taylor, the Director General of the Army Medical Department; the alarming figures and facts contained in a Blue Book issued by the Home Office during the early part of 1902 regarding the employment of school children; and more particularly the appearance of a report about this time of the Royal Commission on Physical Training in Scotland—all these factors served to arouse in a hitherto complacent public some degree of concern respecting the health of the nation. Hence the appointment by the Balfour Government in September, 1903 of the Commission on Physical Deterioration.

Among the causes of physical deterioration which the report cited, the lack of suitable housing facilities was regarded as the most grievous. "This evil," according to the findings of the commission, was "greatest in one-room tenements." In Glasgow, for instance, the death rate was twice as large in this type of habitation as in the better houses of the city.[1] Mr. Henry Wilson, an inspector of factories, in reply to a question as to the housing of the masses, testified that in certain Edinburgh districts "no less than 45 per cent of the population . . . lived in one-roomed or two-roomed dwellings."[2] According to the testimony of Miss Garrett, head of a settlement of philanthropic women in the Staffordshire potteries, it was rarely the case that more than two rooms in a house were to be found in the workers' quarters and these houses, she added, were occupied by as many as eight adults.[3] The evidence of Dr. Nestor of Newcastle was likewise condemnatory of "the miserable

[1] *Parliamentary Report on Physical Deterioration,* vol. i, sec. 86, p. 17.

[2] *Ibid.,* sec. 112, p. 22.

[3] *Ibid.,* sec. 114, p. 23.

housing and high rates" that prevailed, which, he said, constituted a prolific cause of both physical and mental deterioration.[1] Despite the situation revealed by this part of the report no adequate or satisfactory legislation was forthcoming. The only housing measure which was enacted after 1900 was the meagre and totally insufficient Act of 1903. Sir John Gorst, in 1903, wrote that the problem of the housing of the working-classes was "awaiting solution with no prospect of being taken in hand."[2]

The underfeeding of children was another startling feature of the report which showed that sixteen to twenty per cent of the entire school population suffered from lack of sufficient food. According to the testimony of Mr. W. H. Libby, who for thirty years had been a master in London schools, a considerable number of the pupils were unable to study because they were hungry.[3] Dr. Eicholz, who was one of the expert witnesses before the committee, was of the opinion that 122,000 of the elementary school population of London, or about sixteen per cent, were underfed.[4] Conditions among the school population were just as bad in the provinces, as the testimony of Mr. J. B. Atkins, one of the editors of the *Manchester Guardian,* abundantly proved. In Ireland they were much worse than elsewhere according to the unhappy account of school life given by the Bishop of Ross.[5] As for Scotland, the medical officer of the Local Government Board testified that in the slums of Edinburgh a large proportion of the children were half starved and

[1] *Parliamentary Report on Physical Deterioration,* vol. i, sec. 110, p. 22.

[2] *Nineteenth Century,* 1903 (vol, 53), p. 520.

[3] *Parliamentary Report on Physical Deterioration,* vol. ii, p. 229.

[4] *Ibid.,* sec. 435, p. 20.

[5] *Ibid.,* vol. i, sec. 305, p. 60.

that it was the height of cruelty to subject them to school routine.[1]

The Committee was unanimous in its recommendations that local educational authorities should be empowered to provide meals for undernourished children who received improper or insufficient food at home. Sir John Gorst, who was actively interested in all the proceedings of this investigation, urged Parliament, even before the report was completed, to enact legislation necessary to remedy the situation. Speaking in the House of Commons, he declared that the nation provided instruction in the schools "at an enormous expense," but, unhappily, a very great number of the children were so undernourished that it was brutal and wasteful to impose upon them any school tasks.[2] There was little use, he declared on a later occasion, in spending vast sums of money upon thousands of children whose physical condition did not permit them to benefit by what they were taught. The school authorities, he said, should be responsible for feeding these children.[3]

Sir John Gorst was not the only member of his party who was alive to the necessity of remedial action. Mr. Balfour, who as Prime Minister was so indifferent to many other needed social reforms at this period, seems to have been in sympathy with the foregoing proposals. In a paper, which he read at the Cambridge meeting of the Anthropological Institute shortly after the Physical Deterioration Report was made, he said that "children should be fed before they were taught." As things were then arranged the State neither fed them nor took any steps to enforce the duty on the parents. "To force a hungry or continually underfed child to any exertion of mind or body" was, in his opinion, "abso-

[1] *Parliamentary Report on Physical Deterioration,* vol. i, sec. 338, p. 67.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 118:1425.

[3] *Ibid.,* vol. 123:1351-1355.

lute cruelty." He also favoured giving the local authorities power to deal with this problem in an effective manner.[1]

In Parliament the conviction was growing that some action should be taken and on 18 April 1905, Mr. Slack, a Liberal member, moved that the "local authorities . . . should be empowered to make provision for ensuring that all children at any public elementary school shall receive proper nourishment before being subjected to mental or physical instruction."[2] This proposal was of course opposed by Sir Frederick Banbury (Unionist) and only received mild support from Sir William Anson, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education. Because of the attitude of the Government Sir Walter Foster (Unionist) joined with Sir John Gorst in making a protest because a more aggressive temper was not displayed in hastening the progress of Mr. Slack's measure.[3]

This indifference to the call of Tory Democracy was very costly. As Tory Democracy had contributed to the victories of the party in the elections of 1885 and in 1895 so its later eclipse was to be a factor in the defeat of 1906. The party was to learn again that the practice of Tory Democracy resulted in political life and prosperity and that its neglect meant weakness and destruction.[4] This view is sanctioned

[1] *Report of the Papers and Discussion of the Cambridge Meeting of the Anthropological Institute,* p. 27.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 145:535.

[3] The support which was accorded the Bill did not proceed along party lines. Mr. Slack's Bill, which was duly placed on the statute-book, was not sufficiently comprehensive, however, to meet the needs of the situation. One year later (1906) the Liberals passed a more adequate measure. (*6 Edw. VII.*, ch. 57). In 1909, as a result of this legislation over 16,000,000 meals were furnished undernourished children. These figures testify to the need of this reform. See S. P. Orth, *Socialism and Democracy* (New York, 1913), p. 232.

[4] *Cf. Nineteenth Century,* vol. 53, p. 520. See also an editorial in the *Times,* which says that the Conservative working-men gave the Conservative party a majority in 1895 because of their social reform programme. The *Times,* Feb. 9, 1907, p. 11.

by many competent political authorities. Mr. Fabian Ware (now Sir Fabian Ware), who was the progressive editor of the *Morning Post* during the years following 1906, attributed the decline of the Unionists at that time to the abandonment of the Churchillian ideals. In a contribution appearing in the *Nineteenth Century* in 1907 he wrote as follows:

Many Unionists naturally prefer at present to look forward to the future, which may have good fortune in store for them, rather than backwards into the immediate past, which is black with a great party disaster. This attitude is very human when adopted by the leaders who are directly responsible for that disaster. And yet it is precisely at times such as these that a healthy mind seeks courage in the past, searching in the party records for the causes of defeat and regaining hope and vigour by studying the means through which earlier disasters were repaired. It is necessary to go back more than twenty years to find history repeating itself, and then the outlook of the Conservative party was not one whit less gloomy than is that of the Unionist party today. One man more than any other restored the fortunes of Conservatism. His success was due no more to his striking personality and vigorous methods than to the new faith he preached. While, therefore, we may have to wait many a dreary day for the individual who can repeat Lord Randolph Churchill's triumphs in Opposition, we may well ask ourselves whether a departure from his faith is not the origin of the evils which have befallen us. Murmurs are, indeed, heard from rank and file, complaining that it was because the Conservative leaders lost sight of the essential principles of Tory Democracy that they so utterly failed to command the confidence of the people at the recent elections.

He considered it to be significant that with the single exception of a letter by Sir John Gorst, which appeared in the *Times*, Lord Randolph Churchill's memory had not been in-

voked by any Unionist leader during this period. On the other hand, two Liberals, in the persons of Lord Rosebery and Mr. Winston Churchill, had given to the public important publications dedicated to the memory of the great Tory Democrat. Mr. Churchill, it was pointed out, had appealed to his father's political career in such a manner as to justify his leaving the Conservative ranks and going over to the Liberals. Furthermore, he suggested that his father, had he lived, would have adopted a similar course. Mr. Ware interpreted the silence of the Unionists with respect to the biographies of Lord Randolph which had appeared, as proof of their indifference to Tory Democracy and those progressive influences to which they had in former years owed their strength and tenure of office. He insisted that only by returning to the principles of Tory Democracy would the broken fortunes of the Unionists be restored.[1]

Communications which appeared in the Unionist press following the General Election of January, 1906, expressed a similar conviction. The party defeat, wrote one correspondent, was due to the fact that the British workers were in a state of revolt and for this situation the Conservative leaders were responsible.[2] Another writer warned the party that it must resume sympathetic contact with the workers.[3] A leading article in the *Morning Post* asserted that the election taught the Unionists that they must cease to be "the party of stucco respectability and come forward as leaders of an enlightened and united democracy." They "must deal with the realities of life as they appear to the poorer classes," was the opinion expressed.[4] In the same issue of

[1] *Nineteenth Century,* 1907 (vol. 61), p. 405.

[2] *Morning Post,* Feb. 5, 1906, p. 4.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 4.

[4] *Ibid.,* Jan. 31, 1906, p. 5.

this Tory organ appeared another article warning the leaders of the necessity of reconstructing the party on a more democratic basis. The writer then proceeded to give the following timely advice:

> If the Unionist party has for a brief period lost sight of this aim, if it wandered during the last months of its supremacy from the paths in which it had been guided by Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Randolph Churchill . . . it must return to these in spite of all its Liberal friends who claim a monopoly of democratic ideas.[1]

Another contributor recalled the fact that it was formerly the boast of the Unionists "that they were the party of social reform" and it was upon those lines—"the lines of Tory Democracy and not Conservatism that the reorganization of the party must proceed."[2] Lord Milner at a Unionist gathering in 1907 likewise took his party to task for having allowed others to appropriate its social reform programme including old-age pensions.[3]

In the discussion which went on in the columns of the *Morning Post* relative to the low estate of Toryism Mr. Balfour's leadership received considerable criticism for having been indifferent to needed reforms. The complaint was made that he had "done much to arrest the forces of Tory Democracy started by Disraeli and brought to full power by Lord Randolph Churchill."[4] A contributor to the *Fortnightly Review* after calling attention to the fact that Mr. Balfour in 1906 would lead "the smallest Conservative or Unionist following which has existed for more than a century and a quarter," significantly suggested that if he would

[1] *Morning Post*, Jan. 31, 1906, p. 6.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[3] *National Unionist Leaflet*, no. 118, p. 3.

[4] *Morning Post*, Feb. 2, 1906, p. 4.

read *Sybil,* study the Labour Party and read *Sybil* again, he might survive.[1] Whatever Tory Democracy this Conservative leader had possessed when he sat with Lord Randolph Churchill below the gangway had long since been forgotten. Mr. Gibson Bowles once told the House that Mr. Balfour on the Treasury Bench was not the same as "in the young and enthusiastic days . . . when he was a shining light . . . of the Fourth Party."[2] There had been too much of the "Hatfield temper" to suit one of the numerous Unionist malcontents of that day, who said the country wanted a total change.[3]

Another critic found fault with the Conservative leaders because they lived in an atmosphere apart from the vast majority of the people whom they were supposed to represent. A programme of reconstruction, it was again stated, had been expected to follow the conclusion of the war in South Africa but it had not been forthcoming. Housing, unemployment and other domestic reforms needed urgent attention but were neglected. Hence a change of leaders or of policy was imperative. This writer expressed the opinion that the party must "have new leadership to become what the Earl of Beaconsfield used to call the National Party."[4] Mr. Dudley S. A. Cosby in an article entitled "The Conservative Disaster" which appeared in the *Westminster Review* had a like message. The Conservatives, he wrote, must return to a programme of social reform and thus retrieve their mistakes.[5] A Unionist writer for the *Nineteenth Century,* referring to the necessity of party reorganization, attributed the trouble to adhering exclusively to the narrow

[1] *Fortnightly Review,* 1906 (vol. 85), p. 426.
[2] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 114:92.
[3] *Fortnightly Review,* 1902 (vol. 78), p. 166.
[4] *Morning Post,* Feb. 2, 1906, p. 6.
[5] *Westminster Review,* 1906 (vol. 165), p. 236.

traditions of the past. The party machinery, he thought, would have to be reconstructed on a "broader and more popular basis" and more consideration would have to be given to the artisans who formed such a large proportion of the Conservative membership.[1]

This conviction deepened during the years following 1906. It was necessary to vitalize the dead bones of the Unionist party, declared a party worker in Hampshire, who was obviously impatient with the policy of negation which had obtained in the past.[2] A more forward policy was demanded in some further correspondence from the same quarter.[3] The *Times* in an editorial suggested by a letter from Sir John Gorst protesting against the reactionary tendencies of the party, remarked that it was well to give heed to the warning which was sounded in this communication. Negation was not enough. A constructive social programme, the *Times* went on to say, was necessary.[4] A contributor to the *Westminster Review* expressed the opinion that the Liberals were in power because they were "carrying out what democracy demands" and the Unionists would have to realize that fact fully before they could hope "to sweep the country."[5] Mr. J. Ellis Barker, in the *Fortnightly Review*, expressed the view that the Unionist policy had resulted in driving working-men into the opposing political camp. If the Unionist party was to regain control it would have to become more fully democratized.[6] To return to the policies of Disraeli and Churchill and thus correct the mistakes and

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, 1906 (vol. 60), p. 126.

[2] The *Times*, Jan. 29, 1907, p. 12.

[3] *Ibid.*, Feb. 7, 1907, p. 4.

[4] *Ibid.*, Feb. 9, 1907, p. 11.

[5] *Westminster Review*, 1913 (vol. 179), p. 585.

[6] *Fortnightly Review*, 1909 (vol. 92), p. 304.

omissions which led to the disaster of 1906 was the exhortation of Mr. F. E. Smith (Lord Birkenhead). He was convinced that the Conservative party would "never conquer a majority . . . until it re-establishes itself in the confidence of the great industrial centers." [1] The party was sick and needed a remedy. Tory Democracy was the tonic which would restore its vigour and health. This was the prescription contained in Mr. Maurice Wood's article, "Tory Democracy—the Road to Power." [2] To establish "a better intercourse between" the workers and the party leaders was the goal advocated by a contributor in *Blackwoods*.[3] Even Mr. Balfour in a speech before the Constitutional Club on the evening of 6 February 1911, admitted that indifference to demands for a more aggressive programme of social reform was a considerable factor in the reverses suffered by the Unionists. The return of the Liberals, he said, was due "to a movement which saw in the possession of power by a Radical administration some great gain for the social ideals of the country." Mr. Harry Roberts in a paper which he read at Beaconsfield, and which later had a private circulation in pamphlet form, urged the necessity of Toryism having a truly constructive programme to deal with the spirit of industrial unrest which had seized the masses. It was a laudable discontent which the Conservatives should try to understand. He was sure the next election would be won if the party strove hopefully and honestly to supply the needs of the workers' unsatisfied life.[4]

This advice from so many quarters was not disregarded. Furthermore the punishment inflicted on the party in 1906

[1] *Littell's Living Age,* 1912 (vol. 274), p. 586.

[2] *Fortnightly Review,* 1911 (vol. 96), pp. 210-227.

[3] *Blackwoods Magazine,* 1910 (vol. 187), p. 293.

[4] H. Roberts, *Constructive Conservatism,* p. 5.

made the Unionists amenable and ready to listen once more to the voice of Tory Democracy. Of course there were plenty of reactionaries who remained unbending and unresponsive. "We are at the parting of the ways," exclaimed one of the old Tories in 1906, who was fearful that the demands of the "young and ardent spirits" would lead the party along the path of modernism and reform in an effort to surpass the Liberal party by "outbidding them for the Labour vote." [1] Another representative of the same group, a few years later, warned his party that it would never regain power by trying to imitate Mr. Lloyd George. The Unionists should not strive to be like the Radicals, as some members of the party were urging. It was their business to be unlike them.[2] But these counsels, for the most part, were disregarded. Many of the leaders, in a chastened mood, were ready to renew their allegiance to the principles of Disraeli and Lord Randolph Churchill. Mr. Bonar Law frankly stated that there was a spirit of industrial unrest abroad. It should not be repressed, he said, but should be studied in a sympathetic manner and adequate steps should be taken to remedy existing social wrongs.[3] On another occasion, he declared that he was not satisfied with the unequal distribution of wealth in England nor with the social conditions which then existed.[4]

As for the Tory Democrats, they became more aggressive than ever after 1906 and carried on a campaign in support of the many reforms which were before Parliament and the country during the years preceding the World War. The *Morning Post,* as has been indicated elsewhere, assumed an aggressive initiative in advocacy of an advanced social pro-

[1] *Fortnightly Review,* 1906 (vol. 85), p. 828.

[2] *Ibid.,* 1911 (vol. 96), p. 998.

[3] *Glasgow Herald,* Nov. 25, 1910, p. 10.

[4] The *Times,* Dec. 17, 1912, p. 8.

gramme. When the Labour party brought forward their Bill providing for increased facilities wherewith to feed undernourished school children, the *Morning Post's* Parliamentary correspondent vigorously supported the proposal.[1] Old-age pensions,[2] government labour exchanges and adequate legislation dealing with unemployment,[3] trade unions for women [4] and a plea for a more favourable attitude towards organized labour generally,[5] better merchant shipping acts looking to increased safety provisions and the welfare of sailors,[6] adequate legislation providing model dwellings and better housing for the workers,[7] and a more adequate school system, including an extension of secondary education,[8] were some of the reforms advocated by this Tory organ. A leading article urging a generous policy towards the Boers was an earnest of the temper which characterized the *Morning Post* at that time.[9]

A similar spirit was displayed in an editorial dealing with India. The writer frankly stated that the British Government was one which was not loved by the natives. There had not been as much sympathy with the people as there ought to have been. A sufficient knowledge of the natives and their aspirations and ways of thinking was lacking. The opinion was expressed that the officials were too bureaucratic and too narrow. The article went on to say: "Indian administration directed from central offices has got sadly

[1] *Cf. Morning Post,* March 3, 1906, p. 8.
[2] *Ibid.,* March 15, 1906, p. 6.
[3] *Ibid.,* March 24, 1906, p. 7.
[4] *Ibid.,* March 22, 1906, p. 6.
[5] *Ibid.,* March 21, 1906, p. 6.
[6] *Ibid.,* March 21, 1906, p. 6.
[7] *Ibid.,* March 19, 1906, p. 6.
[8] *Ibid.,* March 17, 1906, p. 6.
[9] *Ibid.,* March 5, 1906, p. 6.

out of touch with native life. These men never lived among the natives in the villages; their life was spent at a desk and their leisure in the relaxations of the Residency." A situation had developed in which "paper" had become "supreme and vital experience among the natives" had fallen "to a discount".[1]

Likewise, many Unionists, including the leaders of the party, who were not regarded as Tory Democrats, did not hesitate on occasion to give their sanction and support to the more important reforms which were before the country during this period. Their response to the appeal of Tory Democracy was seen, for instance, in their attitude towards the Insurance Act which Mr. Lloyd George introduced in 1911. Although many of its details met with stout opposition, there were those within the party who heartily favoured its main proposals. Mr. H. W. Forster, M. P., in a speech at Bromley said that the Unionist party "welcomed the object of the Bill," in its fight on sickness and disease. The system of universal insurance was a laudable undertaking and would receive his support and that of other Unionists. "Surely," he added, "the health of the country ought not to be a party question."[2] Mr. Balfour, speaking at the 44th Annual Conference of the National Union of Conservative Associations in 1910, declared that the Unionists were committed to the scheme of national insurance against sickness and invalidity. He added that the party would be false to its traditions if there was not a desire "to see the policy of the Workmen's Compensation Act extended" more fully.[3] Mr. Austen Chamberlain in an election address to his constituents at Worcestershire in 1910

[1] *Morning Post,* March 12, 1906, p. 6.

[2] *Bromley District Times,* July 21, 1911, p. 5.

[3] *National Unionist Leaflet,* no. 1398, p. 3.

likewise affirmed that the Unionist programme included "the establishment of a system of State-aided insurance against sickness, invalidity and the reform of the Poor-law." [1] As spokesman for his party in the House of Commons in May, 1911, Mr. Chamberlain congratulated Mr. Lloyd George for introducing his Insurance Bill. He then went on to say that the Bill "ought not be made the subject of party strife" and consequently he and his political associates would accord in their good will and support.[2] That this attitude on the part of the Unionists was maintained throughout the progress of the Bill is evinced by Mr. Lloyd George's statement in the House of Commons some three months after Mr. Chamberlain's commitment. The Chancellor of the Exchequer at that time freely acknowledged the help given by the Opposition. He said that the Unionists in the Committee had made every effort to improve his scheme. "In view of the alterations made," he is quoted as saying, "I think on the whole they are improvements on the Bill. I say quite frankly that all these criticisms from both sides of the House have been exceedingly helpful. . . . I have received some valuable help from members of all parties." [3]

That the Unionists merited Mr. Lloyd George's generous appreciation can be seen from an examination of the *Parliamentary Debates* which are filled with amendments and suggestions for improving the National Insurance Bill. Among those who were most active in co-operating for the successful issue of the reform were Mr. L. Worthington Evans, Lord Henry Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. G. Locker-Lampson, Mr. H. W. Forster, Mr. W. C. Bridgman and others. On

[1] *Glasgow Herald,* Nov. 25, 1910, p. 10.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5 series, vol. 25:6650-6651.

[3] *Ibid.,* 4th series, vol. 29:734-735, 752. Unfortunately this amiable spirit respecting the Bill was not destined to last. By October it had become a matter of bitter partisan strife.

11 July Lord Henry Cavendish Bentinck, one of the more recent representatives of Tory Democracy, suggested an amendment which would extend the working of the "Improved Medical Benefit" clause.[1] Mr. Lloyd George replied to this suggestion by saying that it was "a consequential amendment" and that he would "agree to it." Mr. L. Worthington Evans proposed the elimination of an unfortunate provision in the "Waiting Periods and Benefit" clause which necessitated delays for the insured and which was apt to work inconvenience and hardship.[2] This change was duly effected. Mr. Bridgman moved an amendment to the "Sickness Benefit with Board and Lodging" clause so as to remove obstacles which otherwise would prevent large numbers of domestic servants and farm labourers from participating except at great inconvenience in the benefits of the Bill.[3] Mr. Bridgman's proposal was duly adopted. An additional clause was added to that section of the Bill which had to do with "Re-Insurance for the purposes of Maternity Benefit." This provision, which gave a more effective guarantee to those entitled to maternity benefits, was the work of Mr. G. Locker-Lampson.[4] Improvements of the "Deposit Contributors' Benefits" plans [5] and those of the "Deposit Contributors' Contributions" [6] were made through the efforts of Mr. F. Cassel, another Unionist who was interested in the success of the measure. Through the activities of Mr. Worthington Evans and Mr. H. W. Forster the "Soldiers' and Sailors' Benefits" clause was so altered

[1] *Parliamentary Debates* 4th series, vol. 28:737-738.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 796.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 885.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. 30:479.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 947.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 820.

that soldiers' and sailors' benefits would not be prejudiced because of prior pension allowances.[1] The "Special provisions as to Aliens" clause was bettered through Mr. Worthington Evans's efforts.[2] He also was responsible for a change in the "Substituted Benefit" provisions which effected a more flexible arrangement for domestic servants.[3]

Whereas all the foregoing amendments were incorporated in the Act, many other suggested changes which Unionists believed to be desirable failed of acceptance. A list of these well-intentioned but rejected amendments included a proposition by Mr. J. F. Hope to continue sickness and disablement benefits to old persons who were not eligible for old-age pensions and who were over seventy years of age.[4] Mr. Worthington Evans's efforts to reduce the waiting period for sickness benefit from 26 to 13 weeks,[5] Mr. Goulding's plan to make sick pay payable from the first day of illness,[6] and Captain E. F. Morrison Bell's amendment to reduce the time specified in the "Disablement Benefit Waiting Period",[7] were turned down. Other efforts by Mr. Worthington Evans to effect reduced insurance for the Deposit Contributors class[8] and to provide a more adequate sickness benefit for soldiers while in the service[9] were also repulsed. The same treatment was accorded his scheme to remedy certain features which contained the seeds of bureaucracy,[10] a fore-

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 28, p. 142.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 1097.
[3] *Ibid.*, vol. 31:1135.
[4] *Ibid.*, vol. 38:772.
[5] *Ibid.*, vol. 28:796.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 704.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 837.
[8] *Ibid.*, vol. 30:915-916.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 915-916.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 1554.

boding which was realized in the later working of the Act. This same member, who displayed a constant and solicitous interest in the measure, proposed that recipients of sickness and disablement insurance should in certain cases be granted full benefits although the sum should amount to more than two-thirds of their previous wages.[1] This also was rejected, as was the proposal of Mr. L. C. Amery which had to do with benefits granted to married women.[2]

When the Act was amended in 1913 interested Unionist members again came forward with proposals which they believed would increase its value. But they failed to command the approval and support of the Government.[3]

An account of housing reform during the years following the Boer war resembles in many ways the record of the Unionists with respect to sickness insurance. There was the same indifference and neglect by reason of the war activities, as has been indicated elsewhere. Likewise, there was an earnest effort on the part of the more advanced members of the party to further this reform, not only when their own party held office, but during the days of Liberal supremacy as well.

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 28:898-900, 917-918.

[2] *Ibid.,* vol. 30: 1045.

[3] Mr. Locker-Lampson moved several amendments which had as their object the extension of full benefits to persons under twenty-one. On 28 July 1913, he made an effort to introduce a change which would have benefited the casual labourer, and a week later he made an amendment which would have allowed greater scope in the choice of physicians for insured persons. Mr. E. A. Goulding once more sought to effect a provision for benefits beginning on the first day of sickness. He also moved for the second time an amendment with the object of curbing what he believed to be the undue and arbitrary powers granted the commissioners. Mr. Worthington Evans on July 23 introduced an amendment to protect the funds of societies effected by the Act. Two weeks later he moved another amendment intended to improve one of the administrative features of the measure. All these proposed changes were submitted during the last days of July and the first part of August, 1913.

When the Housing and Town Planning Act was introduced by the Asquith Government in 1908 a group of Tory social reformers gave it their sincere support. Mr. Alfred Lyttelton, a former Unionist Secretary for the Colonies, in his speech of 12 May 1908, said that he and his party wanted to support the proposed legislation in a "friendly and non-controversial spirit."[1] Good housing, observed a Unionist writer a few years later, was outside of party politics and was cheerfully admitted on both sides of the House.[2]

During the years just prior to the World War the new generation of Tory Democrats became desirous of a more vigorous housing policy than that which the Liberals seemed disposed to undertake. Numerous speeches were made to reveal the urgency of the situation. The census figures of 1911 were quoted to show that one-tenth of the population were living in overcrowded quarters and that 500,000 people inhabited one-room tenements. Sir Arthur Griffith-Boscawen in the course of a speech in 1914 on the Local Government (Ireland) Act declared that in Dublin alone "118,000 people were badly housed." He supplied statistics showing that 12,000 people were packed together at the rate of four in a room: 8,000 were housed on a basis of six in a room, and several cases were instanced of twelve people occupying the same room.[3]

Aroused by the desperate situation which these figures revealed in Dublin and other urban centers of the United Kingdom the "Young Tories" undertook to prepare housing legislation on "bold and progressive lines."[4] A notable instance of their efforts was the Boscawen Bill of 1912.

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 188:1033.

[2] *Nineteenth Century,* 1912 (vol. 72) p. 432.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates,* 4th series, vol. 61:350-355.

[4] Lord Henry Bentinck, *Tory Democracy* (London, 1918), p. 83.

The author of this measure in addressing the House on his proposed legislation, which he insisted was offered in a non-partisan spirit, expressed the conviction that there could be no social reform unless suitable provision was made for home life. Proper housing, he insisted, was the basis of "national health and national character." He went on to say that it was futile to expect to rear "a great imperial race in horrible slums" without sufficient light and air, "in insanitary surroundings, in places where children brought into the world have nothing to look at except what is squalid, horrible and dirty." He remarked that housing legislation was not in itself sufficient. He agreed with Mr. Lloyd George that these laws frequently lacked vitality, that they were not put to use, and too often were "mummies". He therefore urged the necessary administrative changes which were contained in his proposed Bill.[1] In 1913 the measure was re-introduced with valuable additions.[2] On June 12 of that year he addressed the House again on the subject which was engaging the earnest attention, not only of himself, but of a group of Tory Democrats including Lord Henry Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Walter Guinness, Mr. Astor, Col. Kyffin Taylor, Mr. Montague Barlow and Mr. Charles Bathurst.[3] He drew the attention of his hearers once more to the deplorable state of overcrowding which, he declared, resulted in "100,000 deaths every year — a bigger number than were killed during the South African War." He quoted a rector of Pelton who said that he got so sick of burying infants that he "could stand it no longer" and so "had to leave the place." He stated that the infantile death rate in some localities was as high as 193 per thousand.[4]

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 35:1442-1427.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 50:452.

[3] Lord Henry Bentinck, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 53:1823-1827.

But Mr. Boscawen's measure was opposed by Liberal members whose speeches, according to Lord Henry Bentinck, were full of "early Victorian economics." [1] The Bill called forth in particular the bitter and wrathful hostility of Mr. John Burns. He would have none of it. He smote the proposed legislation hip and thigh and caricatured its sponsors as "economic fledglings who thought that the last word on housing had been uttered when they had delivered a speech after they had motored through a London slum in a taxi-cab." [2] Mr. John Burns, then, whose radical arteries had throbbed with such warmth on a certain February day in 1886 at Trafalgar Square, but had since become so hardened that he was described in 1906 as the most "reactionary President of the Local Government Board for many years past," [3] was to some degree, at least, responsible for blocking a housing programme, which, if it had been adopted would have mitigated many of the evils which were to plague the nation during the years following the World War. That Mr. Burns displayed a culpable obstinacy in this matter was the opinion of more than one London periodical. Upon the failure of the Griffith-Boscawen Bill the *Christian Commonwealth* expressed the conviction that Mr. Burns would have to go before there could be any progress made in housing reform.[4] The *Daily Chronicle,* which at the time was an independent Liberal organ, likewise criticised Mr. Burns and the Government for strangling the proposed housing legislation. "Why," asked this journal, "does the Government never bring in nor take over such a measure? Why does it defy the overwhelming majority of the House and the quasi-unanimity of experts?" The answer,

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 51:2283.
Lord Henry Bentinck, *op. cit.,* p. 83-84.
[3] The *Times,* Nov. 20, 1906, p. 12.
[4] The *Christian Commonwealth,* May 7, 1913, p. 557.

according to this daily, was to be found in the pedantic and intemperate utterances of Mr. Burns. These statements were followed by a harsh criticism of Mr. Burns' administration of the Local Government Board. As President he had made his department a by-word for "slowness and inefficiency." The article concluded by declaring that "when all the dust of minor arguments had settled down, the very awkward situation remains and cannot be brushed aside, that a great social reform is being arrested indefinitely by a strong-willed minister." [1] Another Liberal paper, the *Daily News and Leader,* referred to the effect which the situation was bound to make on the worker when he understood that the Tories were willing to enter upon a suitable housing programme and were being balked by the party in power. The writer then proceeded to say that if the Liberals were content to pursue a "policy of simple opposition" they would have to reconcile themselves to losing the support and regard of a large part of the electorate.[2]

Other housing measures were introduced by the Tories, including a bill by Lord Salisbury whereby the Government was to loan to prospective home-builders the necessary funds at a low rate of interest.[3] This principle was supported by Lord Lansdowne who said that "advances for the purpose of house building should be made at the lowest possible rates which the Government could afford not only to local bodies . . . but to private associations and private individuals." [4] A housing Bill was introduced in 1912 by Mr. Stanier but it was set aside. His measure was again presented by Mr. Fletcher in 1913. Mr. Burns vigorously

[1] *Daily Chronicle,* April 19, 1913, p. 6.

[2] *Daily News and Leader,* May 19, 1913, p. 2.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates,* (House of Lords), 5th series, vol. 13:294-307.

[4] The *Times,* June 23, 1914, p. 4.

opposed it in the debate on the second reading [1] and it met the same fate as the other measures. In 1914 Mr. Burns withdrew from the Local Government Board and was succeeded by Mr. Samuel. It is significant that the King's speech of that year promised immediate housing reform.[2]

In the meantime the Disraelian Tories continued their agitation in various ways. Lord Henry Bentinck, writing in the *Contemporary Review* in May, 1913, made a plea for "co-partnership housing" which had been successful in Belgium and in those parts of England where it had been tried. But to be effective on a wide and comprehensive scale, financial aid, he pointed out, would have to be forthcoming from the Government. The attitude of the authorities, however, and particularly the indifference of "the Levites of the Local Government Board," who refused to co-operate financially or otherwise, only served to discourage those agencies which were striving to solve the problem in an earnest and conscientious manner.[3] In the following year Lord Henry Bentinck called the attention of the House of Commons to the deplorable housing of workers who were employed by the Government at the Rosyth dockyards. He referred to the fact that in the past the authorities had been content with a situation which left the workingmen no alternative other than spending their leisure in the public houses and sleeping in lodging houses which were unfit for human habitation. He asked the Admiralty if it were not possible to see to it that when they spent "the public money" it should be "for the general welfare of the people and not for their degradation and general demoralization." [4] Lord Robert Cecil also brought forward in the

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 51: 765-780.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 58:52-53.

[3] *Contemporary Review*, 1913 (vol. 103), p. 625.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 59:1760-1763.

House of Commons, in the form of a Parliamentary question, the overcrowding and the unsanitary conditions which obtained at Rosyth.[1]

In 1918, when Mr. Fisher, as President of the Local Government Board, moved the second reading of the Government's proposed Housing Bill, Lord Henry Bentinck criticised it because "it did nothing to promote a broad comprehensive scheme of town planning." He expressed the view that "housing schemes of the future should provide, among other things, for an adequate supply of main roads, facilities for churches and other institutions, and for playgrounds for children and grown-up people." He referred to those members of Parliament who in their remarks on this subject seemed to be mainly concerned with the rights of the "speculative builder." He declared that as a result of the World War there was an unmistakable demand for a real reconstruction programme. The soldiers who at that moment were bringing the conflict to a successful conclusion were determined to maintain "an adequate standard of life." This meant housing conditions which would "not lower the health and morality of the people but strengthen their physical and moral welfare; and if the political parties, whether Liberal or Conservative, in the near future" could "not get an adequate standard of life and decent housing for the people it" would "be all the worse for the political parties." While the members of the House during the years before the war had been squabbling among themselves and giving expression to their "early Victorian economics, . . . vested interests" had "been driving the people into a corner and depriving their children of any kind of playgrounds except the gutter, the alley and the court, and" had "been killing off their children by the thousands." He added that

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 58:1741.

he had no apology to make for being a "town-planner" to which group the *Times* had made a disparaging reference a short time before. He declared that "the alternative was to go back to the old lines, which was to crowd as many houses as possible into an area, to extract every penny from every single inch of ground and which had no other idea of town planning than to put a public house at every corner." He insisted that a bolder and more comprehensive scheme was needed than that contained in the Bill which they were then considering. Adequate transport facilities which would cheaply and readily convey the workers out of the crowded areas into wider spaces in the suburbs should be a conspicuous part of any well-considered proposal. Continuing, he said: "We want to see conditions whereby every workingman can have a plot of ground to cultivate and a house and surroundings where he can bring up his family in decent, healthy conditions" so "that the amenities of the country shall be preserved as far as possible and that factories and houses shall not be jumbled up as they have been in the past." He advocated the granting of greater powers to the Local Government Board to effect such plans and expressed the hope that amendments would be added to the Bill which would make it more comprehensive. He again referred to the opposition of vested interests to any satisfactory measure and warned the Prime Minister that he would have difficulty in winning the next election unless he displayed more sincerity with respect to the problem, then under discussion, than he had been disposed to show in the past.[1] A year later Lord Henry Bentinck again voiced his protest because the housing situation was still "profoundly unsatisfactory."[2]

Recurring to the same subject in 1923 he described the housing conditions as a blot upon the British social system

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol, 110:1173-1176.

[2] The *Times,* July 1, 1919, p. 7.

and a reproach to civilization. In his opinion a national policy was necessary to remove "this great social injustice." Commenting on the merits of private enterprise as opposed to State enterprise, he expressed the belief that it was desirable to adopt a system which would impose a due share of responsibility on the local authorities. But if they were forced to rely on private enterprise, he felt that there was "no use making a fetish of it." He referred to the Coalition Minister of Health (Sir A. Griffith-Boscawen) as being in sympathy with the views he had expressed. He remarked that the Minister of Health formerly had been identified with the Unionist Social Reform Committee which had introduced a Bill empowering "local authorities to avail themselves of State subsidies in the matter of housing." But this excellent measure, he explained, had been defeated by Mr. Burns.[1]

Lord Robert Cecil whose Tory Democracy had become most pronounced during the years following the World War also participated in the debate on the housing problem and gave expressions to views which were fully as advanced as those of Lord Henry Bentinck. Coming to the defense of the Viscountess Astor who had just been described as a Socialist by that veteran defender of individualism, Sir Frederick Banbury, he proceeded to say:

> I heard her speech advocating improved housing conditions, and I earnestly hope that no section of this House is going to write on its banner that it is against housing reforms, that it believes that the State should cease to interfere to protect the housing conditions of the poorer citizens or any other nonsense of that kind. It is all very well to say that people ought to pay for their housing. So they ought to pay, perhaps, in one sense for everything, but we, at any rate, in this country have very clearly laid it down that, for good or ill, there are many

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 159:1026.

things in which the State shall assist the poorer citizens of the country. We have done it with regard to education and with regard to disease. We have done it with regard to housing in various ways. It may be wrong or right. I myself am quite confident that it would be fantastic folly to go back on that course of legislation. How far you must go may have to be decided in each case, but to say, as my right honourable Friend says to us, that we are to abandon all attempt to assist the improvement of the housing conditions of this country, seems to me to be reaction gone mad. After all, the case for State intervention on housing is a very strong one, indeed. We have heard it elaborated in many aspects by much more eloquent tongues than mine. They have told us that the interests of morality, health, and everything that constitutes the well-being of the people, require good housing.

Lord Robert then called attention to a speech, which had been made by a competent authority, showing the close connection between bad housing and tuberculosis. He argued that it was a " false economy to spend vast sums of money in combating tuberculosis and providing sanatoria " if housing conditions which were the breeding places of that disease were allowed to remain as before.[1] This speech shows how far the Tory Democracy of 1922 had extended the doctrine of *Sanitas sanitatum* which Disraeli had laid down half a century before.

Some of the proposals advocated in the foregoing utterances were embodied in a Bill which was prepared in the early part of 1923 by Mr. Neville Chamberlain, who at that time was Minister of Health in the Cabinet of Mr. Bonar Law. The situation which his measure was designed to remedy was appalling. The dire predictions which had been made by the reforming Tories were more than fulfilled.

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 151 : 1924-1925.

The Ministry of Health in one of its reports during the winter of 1919-1920 estimated that at least 800,000 houses for the working classes alone were urgently needed.[1]

When Mr. Chamberlain in 1923 submitted his plans to amend the Housing Act great expectations were aroused. The Bill empowered local authorities with the concurrence and approval of the Minister of Health to assist any prospective individual builder whose estimated outlay for a house was not to exceed fifteen hundred pounds sterling. Provision was made whereby the Government was to make subsidies to cover estimated losses on small houses, "the balance of the deficit being found by local authorities." The Bill furthermore amended the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act so as greatly to broaden the scope of its operations.[2]

Another reform which has engaged the attention of Tory Democrats during recent years has to do with the evils growing out of the sweated industries. Lord Milner frequently called attention to the necessity of remedial measures. In a speech at Oxford in December, 1907, he spoke in support of a Bill which was then engaging the attention of Parliament and which was designed to deal with the problem of sweated industry. Whole communities, he declared, were being impoverished and weakened by the system.[3] Another good exemplar of Tory Democracy in the person of Mr. Alfred Lyttelton was likewise greatly exercised on the subject.[4] In 1909, speaking in the House of Commons in support of the Liberal Government's measure which had been presented by Mr. Tennant, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Trade, he said that the condition of some of the women and girls in certain trades was

[1] *Cmd.*, 917, p. 12.

[2] The *Times* (weekly edition), April 19, 1923, p. 396.

[3] *Speeches and Addresses of Viscount Milner,* pp. 252-258.

[4] E. Lyttelton, *Alfred Lyttelton—An Account of his Life,* p. 370.

worse than that of slaves. It was tormenting, he declared, to reflect on the horrors which existed in certain quarters as a result of this economic abuse. Because these workers had no political power their condition should make the more powerful appeal to the "chivalrous instincts" of the members of Parliament, which sentiment, he believed, represented the feeling of many members of his own party.[1]

As there had been a culpable indifference to the sweating evil during the period subsequent to the Boer war, so, in the days following the World War there was a similar neglect, not only with respect to sweating, but other industrial abuses, a situation which evoked, at least, one protest from the ranks of Tory Democracy. In May, 1922, Lord Henry Bentinck asked the Coalition Home Secretary, Mr. Shortt, whether the Government intended to bring in a Bill amending the Factory Acts. Upon being informed that such was not their intention, he remarked that action along this line had been promised in the two previous sessions but that the promises had not been fulfilled. The reform, he said, "was long overdue," all of which was admitted readily enough by the Home Secretary.[2]

During the many recent discussions relative to the problems growing out of the mining industry in Great Britain, Tory Democrats maintained much the same attitude as that which characterized their friendly interest in behalf of other reforms. While the Liberals were in power, the Coal Mines Act of 1911,[3] which consolidated and amended previous legislation, and the Coal Mines (Minimum Wage) Act of 1912,[4] received the royal assent. Towards these measures advanced Unionists maintained a benevolent attitude.

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 4:351-353.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 154:997.

[3] *1 & 2 Geo. V.*, ch. 50.

[4] *2 & 3 Geo. V.*, ch. 2.

Throughout the heated controversy in 1919 revolving around the report of the Sankey Commission and the subsequent strike Tory Democracy identified itself with the cause of the miners. Speaking on the mining problem in the House of Commons Lord Robert Cecil remarked that labour was profoundly dissatisfied not only on account of wages but because the worker was not allowed any share in the management of the industry. Not only was the worker entitled to such a participation but there should be some arrangement whereby he could share in the profits. He said that he believed in "what President Wilson called democratization of industry" which he insisted was as reasonable a right "as was the demand for self-government."[1] At a later date he again reverted to the mining problem and the settlement which had been effected. He approved of that part of the agreement which made "wages dependant on profits and which established district and national boards." But he would have liked to have gone further to meet the demands of the miners. Recurring to a favourite and oft-expressed conviction, he said that he regretted that no provision was made for giving them "some share in the responsibility for the working of the mines." He realized that there were many who regarded that as "a dangerous and difficult proposition" but he had hoped that it would receive careful and unprejudiced consideration. Such an arrangement would help remove the atmosphere of suspicion and distrust which obtained in the industry. He further observed that the employers had won the victory and they could afford to be generous and make "great advances" to the men. In the course of his speech, Lord Robert attacked Mr. Lloyd George, because of his violent denunciation of the Labour party and "all that it represented."[2]

[1] The *Times*, July 15, 1919, p. 17.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 144:697-701.

Lord Henry Bentinck likewise was partial to the cause of the miners. He expressed himself in favour of a national pool in order to give the mine workers a more equitable share of the profits. The present wage system, he declared, did not permit of a subsistence level.[1] He believed that the spirit of co-operation should be invoked if there was to be a settlement of the problem. He remarked that he had been greatly impressed by an observation made by the leader of the Welsh miners, who had called attention to the fact that during the war the Government had asked the miners to co-operate but since peace had been declared they had ceased to make any such requests.[2] After visiting a mining district in Nottingham, Lord Henry wrote a letter to the *Times* deploring the use of the "big stick" in settling the mine dispute. "A smashing victory for the mine owners," he observed, "might prove a disaster for the nation." He further suggested that before the miners' demands were dismissed as unreasonable there should be some explanation of the operators' big profits.[3]

Other Unionists have committed themselves to radical views on the subject of the coal industry. Viscount Milner, speaking in the House of Lords, has expressed the conviction that one of the results of the World War is the demand for a greater measure of public control and public ownership, not only of coal, but of other national assets as well. "The old industrial order," he told his fellow peers, was passing, and it was necessary for them all to aid and co-operate in peacefully establishing the new order which would involve "the great socialization of certain fundamental and basic industries."[4]

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, vol. 140:1584.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 133:1002.

[3] The *Times*, June 23, 1921, p. 6.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, House of Lords, 5th series, vol. 35:683-685.

Amongst the multitude of industrial questions which demanded attention in England during the vexed reconstruction period following the World War was that of the railways. An effort was made to solve this problem by the Railways Act of 1921 which reorganized the whole British transportation system. While this measure was before Parliament Lord Robert Cecil maintained much the same attitude which he had displayed towards the mining dispute. When Mr. Barnes (Labour) moved an amendment which provided for seven members of the proposed board of directors of the Amalgamated Railways Companies, being elected by and from the railway workers of these companies, Sir Frederick Banbury (Unionist) vigorously and indignantly opposed the proposal. He maintained that since the workers contributed no capital they therefore had no right to be represented on the board. But Lord Robert Cecil in supporting Mr. Barnes' amendment swept this and other objections aside. He suggested that it would contribute to "the smoother working of the industry if they gave the representatives of the workers a share in the management and therefore a share in the success of the concern." To the objection that such a plan would introduce an element of controversy in the management, he called attention to the fact that in those instances where the experiment had been made no such dissension had resulted. When the worker was once on the board he would, according to Lord Robert, be interested in making a success of the concern. "He thought that it would be an enormous and gigantic gain to industry to try it. They had to face that proposition which they had faced on the political side of their life." In the management of industry as in the management of public affairs there would be discontent in the ranks of the workers "until they had been given a real share in its life." [1]

[1] The *Times*, August 10, 1921, p. 12.

The conviction that the worker should have a greater share in the management of industry has been frequently reiterated by Lord Robert Cecil during recent years. Raising the "status of the worker to that of a partner" is the industrial remedy which he has proposed.[1] In a speech at Letchworth during the autumn of 1919 he expressed the opinion that the main cause of industrial disputes was due to the fact that the workers were not given a proper amount of control. "Labour," he said, "should have a voice not only on wages and conditions but on general policy and direction." In reply to the criticism that this might lead to syndicalism he said that he saw no objection to industries being handed over to the workmen if experience proved they could be better managed by such a transfer.[2] At a private dinner given by the Center Group in London he declared that the industrial problem could not be settled by shorter hours or higher wages, by housing or transport. The remedy he suggested was that of co-partnership. The necessity of humanizing industry was urged. Too often, he said, the worker was treated as a machine.[3] Speaking of the workers in his own constituency, he told the House of Commons, that their real demand was for a greater measure of self-determination. More liberty and freedom and "control of their own destiny" constituted their legitimate demands. He said that they complained in that they were not treated as men and were not given any control in the management of industry.[4] In a speech which was delivered before the Co-partnership Congress held in London in 1920, he declared that a "fundamental misconception" which had been inherited from the past was that a business enterprise

[1] Lord Robert Cecil, *The New Outlook*, p. 22.

[2] The *Times*, Oct. 23, 1919, p. 14.

[3] *Ibid.*, Aug. 1, 1919, p. 12.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 119:2032.

was the sole property of the owner. That, he thought, might be true with respect to the buildings and machinery, but labour also was a vital and important factor which had to be respected.[1] Labour, he said during the course of the Earl Grey Memorial lectures delivered at the Armstrong College in Newcastle in the early part of 1920, did not belong to the owner of a business enterprise as his machinery or horses did. Such a view, which was supported by nineteenth-century economics, was a fruitful cause of strikes and industrial unrest. Too many employers disregarded the human rights of labour. It was this selfish and short-sighted conception of industry, which, in certain quarters, resulted in a demand for a dictatorship of the proletariat. The solution which he again urged was a true partnership between employer and employee in which the latter would have an effective voice in the finances and policies of the concern.[2] "As they had democratized their political institutions," he once told the House of Commons,[3] they would have to democratize likewise the industrial order. It was necessary to remember that labour had "grown up and working-men" could "no longer be treated like children," he observed on another occasion.[4] The worker had passed the stage where he "let out his work for so much money," he declared in one of his recent speeches. He said that the time had come when he should be regarded as "an associate in the business with an equal interest and responsibility . . . and therefore . . . he had a motive given him to work, not merely for his own benefit, but the advancement of the concern as a whole." [5]

[1] The *Times*, Oct. 27, 1920, p. 14.

[2] *Ibid.*, Jan. 19, 1920 p. 7.

[3] *Ibid.*, Aug. 19, 1919, p. 16.

[4] *Ibid.*, April 22, 1922, p. 18.

[5] *Ibid.*, Jan. 26, 1923, p. 7.

Nor was this the only voice raised in behalf of industrial democracy by advanced Tories. Lord Henry Cavendish Bentinck has given expression to the same opinions and Viscount Milner has maintained that the "workers are entitled to have their say about the conduct and policy of the business on which their whole existence depends." In fact Viscount Milner's position is more extreme than that of Lord Robert Cecil in that he is not adverse to the "state ownership" of certain industries.[1]

The unemployment problem has naturally engaged the attention of the more recent Tory Democrats. Lord Henry Bentinck in opposing a proposal to reduce the Unemployment Benefit allowances declared that it was unjust to place the burden of trade depression on the workers. He reminded the House that there was no difficulty in finding money to carry on military activities in Ireland and other objects less worthy than unemployment pensions. He pleaded for a greater manifestation of good will on the part of the Government during the critical period of reconstruction following the war. A proper and sufficient solicitude, he maintained, had been lacking, and this fact was a big factor in aggravating the industrial disorders of the hour. The painful impression was growing among the workers "that the (Coalition) Government were allied with the employers in a frontal attack on the standards of life." The recent speech of the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, at a Coalition dinner in which he denounced those workers, who were discontented with the industrial situation, as Bolsheviks, was, in his opinion, most ill-advised and rendered impossible the good-will and co-operation which were so essential to restore prosperity. The policy of ill-will and strikes would have, the speaker said, the opposite result.[2]

[1] The New York *Times*, Oct. 28, 1923, sec. 9, p. 12.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 143:489-491.

When the Unemployment Bill was before Parliament in 1922 Lord Henry Bentinck again presented the workers' point of view. Referring to the unfortunate plight in which England found herself, he expressed the hope that the day would arrive when the workers would not be bandied about "between the boards of Guardians and the Employment Exchanges." He also looked forward to the time when they would not be living under a system which "enriched one-half of the country and pauperized and degraded the other half." With respect to unemployment he advocated the application of such fundamental economic remedies as would remedy the causes of the evil. Mr. Keynes was quoted to show that the banks and speculation caused part of the trouble. During prosperous seasons there was over-speculation and in times of depression there was a rigid economy. To distribute more equally the industrial activities of the nation, was a matter which, according to Lord Henry, might well engage the attention of Parliament. He referred to the fact that this question was studied by a committee of which he was a member, just before the war. During their deliberations it was suggested that the Government might give more extensive orders during periods of slack trade and thus contribute to the continuity of employment.[1] Lord Robert Cecil also urged the necessity of examining the "root causes of unemployment" instead of relying on palliatives. He expressed the opinion that such an investigation would have to include a consideration of "foreign relations and the organization of industry."[2]

The voice of the new Tory Democracy has been heard in unmistakable tones during recent years in behalf of a fair and generous treatment of the vexed Irish problem. No harsher criticism of the methods of repression and reprisal

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 153:2596.

[2] The *Times*, Jan. 25, 1922, p. 12.

which the Lloyd George Coalition Government pursued was to be heard than that expressed by Lord Robert Cecil, Lord Henry Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Oswald Moseley and other progressive Tories. In the House of Commons in October, 1920, Lord Henry Bentinck, who said that he spoke as "a very old member of the Conservative party" who had always been taught that respect for the law was one of the first tenets of his party, proceeded to denounce the Coalition Government for aggravating the disorders which had obtained in Ireland since 1917. He denied that the accounts of British reprisals in Ireland were due to Sinn Fein propaganda as Sir Hamar Greenwood had pretended. He accused the authorities of using the police and soldiers of the Crown to suppress the political aspirations of the Irish race, and in preventing every kind of gathering including concerts, athletic meets and fairs. Such a policy, he declared, was disastrous and had only served to arouse the indignation and fury of the people; a state of affairs which aggravated the situation and led to increased disorders and outrages. He was quite emphatic in saying that on no account would he condone murder but when the political aspirations of a people were thwarted by oppression then murder and assasination naturally resulted. The past history of Russia, Austria and Italy was cited in proof of this assertion. The familiar saying that "tyranny is the nursing mother of murder" was quoted further to substantiate his contention. He then proceeded to say that the fundamental cause of the deplorable Irish situation consisted in the fact that the whole system was wrong. If there was more crime in Ireland than in England it was because the former was subjected to a worse government. He appealed to the authorities to "abandon an attempt to tyrannize into submission a whole nationality." If they succeeded they would be successful only as Germany had been successful in Belgium during the

Great War and as the Turkish Pasha had been successful "when he devastated a province and called it peace." He urged the Ministry to return to the best traditions of Great Britain and establish a system in Ireland based on the principles of "liberty and self-government." He would have Ireland share the privileges enjoyed by Australia, Canada and South Africa. He hoped the Prime Minister would throw off the evil influences which were determining his policy and "announce that the people of Ireland have a right to elect by proportional representation a constituent assembly for the settlement and management of their problem." He said that he agreed with Lord Grey in his declaration that the starting point in settling this question was "the necessity of the English frankly acknowledging that they were utterly unable to govern Ireland." He also agreed with Lord Grey in saying that the Irish should be given the right to manage their own affairs. He did not "for a moment" believe there would be any danger to England, as some feared, if self-determination was granted, and if the Irish would "give a guarantee to enter the League of Nations" he saw no occasion to be concerned if they had their own army and navy. Towards the close of his remarks Lloyd George's policy again received attention. The Prime Minister, he said, could solve the question at once "if he had the courage of his convictions." But unhappily he had "a small and a petty mind" and a small mind was "ill-assorted with a great Empire." Since he could not take the larger and the more generous view of the situation he urged him to step aside and "allow others of good will and larger mind" to deal with the problem.[1]

Lord Henry Bentinck's bitter opposition to the Irish policy of Mr. Lloyd George and the Coalition Government found expression in the course of another indictment in the

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 133:999-1003.

spring of 1921. Quoting Mr. Bernard Shaw he said it was a policy of "blundering their way into difficulties and bludgeoning their way out." It was a policy which reflected on the nation's honour and patriotism and was contrary to those principles which constituted "the very keystone and foundation of the British Empire." Force and coercion together with political oppression and deliberate attacks on Irish liberty had been the methods employed by the Government since 1917. Hundreds of people had been "prosecuted and imprisoned" for simply "expressing their political opinions." Children, he went on to say, had been "put in prison for whistling Irish tunes and for selling flags on the streets." When this policy produced "subterranean crime" the Prime Minister adopted "a policy of lawless reprisals", which in turn only served "to add recruits to the Irish Republican Army." Instead of repressive methods he implored the Government to use the "British method" of "liberty for the governed." He took issue with Mr. Lloyd George's statement that as Prime Minister he had "done more for Irish liberty than any other Prime Minister" and that his Act was the most generous ever passed in favour of Ireland. Lord Henry denied that a Welshman was a "better judge of Irish liberty than the Irish themselves" who, he declared, hated and detested the measure which the Premier had lauded. The sole remedy, he maintained, was to give "the Irish people the responsibility of framing their own constitution." He then proceeded to make several concrete proposals including the immediate withdrawal of the Black and Tans and the passing of an act which would permit elections in the near future for a Constituent Assembly. He had no objection to stipulating in such an act that in any constitution which might be drawn up by an Irish Assembly there should be provisions for maintaining the sovereignty of the Crown and the protection of Ulster. But he thought

that the fewer stipulations imposed the better it would be. He reminded the House that much the same situation had existed in Canada before the days of Lord Durham. As Canada was given responsible government and found a solution of her problems so would Ireland solve her problems including that of Ulster.[1]

Lord Henry Bentinck carried on his attack of the Government's policy in various ways. A letter to the *Times* containing an extract from Henry Gratton, when moving the Declaration of Irish Rights in 1780, was instanced as an example of the spirit which might well meet the needs of the hour.[2] Sir Hamar Greenwood's unhappy performance in Ireland was duly castigated. Frequent parliamentary questions served to bring to the front the misdeeds of the Government.[3] The Prime Minister was plied with questions from time to time regarding his and the Government's attitude on the question of setting up a Constituent Assembly.[4] Other questions dealt with the reported abuses in the internment camps,[5] the unsanitary condition of Irish prisons,[6] and the scope of activities carried on by the Irish Refugees Relief Committee, the latter question being asked in order to learn if Catholics as well as Protestants shared the benefits of this fund.[7] A double-edged thrust was

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 139:2644-2648.

[2] The *Times,* July 12, 1921, p. 6.

[3] See *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 133:1955. Figures were quoted from the Irish press to show that during the years 1917-1918 the Government were responsible for more than 1200 sentences for political offenses, 115 deportations without trial or charge, 99 suppressions by military force of gatherings of unarmed men, women and children, 32 suppressions of assemblies such as fairs and markets, and 12 suppressions of national newspapers. See also *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 117:314 which refers to the arrest of girls in Killarney for selling flags.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 132:937; vol. 140:2044.

[5] *Ibid.,* 2047.

[6] *Ibid.,* vol. 139:1060.

[7] *Ibid.,* vol. 156:1434.

effected by an ironical question, in connection with a proposal to reduce expenditures for the schools of London, when Lord Henry asked the Minister of Education if he would "not reduce further the expenditure on education in order that there may be more money to waste in the mismanagement of Ireland."[1]

The arraignment of the Government's Irish policy by Mr. Oswald Moseley[2] was even more severe than that of Lord Henry Bentinck. In the course of a speech in the House of Commons he vigorously assailed the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, and Sir Hamar Greenwood. Their "policy of reprisals" he declared to be "a deliberate policy carried out . . . with a deliberate purpose." He asserted that the only possible result of burning the houses of the Irish was to furnish them with excellent propaganda material. The best solution, he went on to say, was to arrive at an agreement with representatives of Ireland which would be "compatible with the safety of" England "and the aspirations of Irish nationality." That, he thought, was possible a year before, but due to the insensate methods which had since been employed by the Government the possibility of evolving such an arrangement seemed doubtful.[3]

Lord Robert Cecil spoke from time to time in favour of a more enlightened and conciliatory policy towards the smaller island. England, he said, would have to learn the lesson of treating "the Irishman as a grown man politically." In the past the mistake had been made of giving the Irish what the English deemed best for them instead of finding

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 139:2224.

[2] It is to be noted that in the spring of 1924 Mr. Moseley, who is the son-in-law of Lord Curzon, withdrew from the Conservative party and cast in his lot with the Labourites. During the years prior to changing his party affiliations he was a progressive Tory of the most pronounced type.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 135:519-524.

out what they themselves wanted.[1] Speaking at Hitchin, in the summer of 1919, he said that the best plan was to have the Irish settle their problems themselves.[2] At a Unionist demonstration during the following year he expressed the same opinion. It was necessary, he said, to give Irish self-government "a fair trial." The principal difficulty, he thought, consisted in a very general suspicion that the Government was tricking them.[3] Like Lord Henry Bentinck and Mr. Moseley, the member for Hitchin censured the policy of reprisals adopted by the Coalition Government. While he made it very clear that a people were not justified in "embarking upon a campaign of murder and outrage" because they were denied political reforms, on the other hand the Government's methods of repression were also blameworthy since their activities were directed not only against crime and outrages in Ireland but against political opinion as well. To arrest people for displaying Sinn Fein colours and to suppress newspapers provoked, rather than suppressed, crime. He declared that the administration of Ireland during the eighteen months prior to October, 1920, had been "one of the most disastrous and tactless things in the history of the country." To bear out his contention specific instances of reprisals by the government forces were instanced. Not only did such a procedure arouse in the Irish populace a feeling of resentment but the effect on public opinion in America and elsewhere was unfavourable. He then directed his remarks to Mr. Winston Churchill, the Secretary of State for War, who had denied that there had been reprisals. Lord Robert demanded that an impartial court of inquiry determine the facts. He gave the House to understand that a mere denial by Mr. Churchill,

[1] The *Times*, March 8, 1920, p. 9.

[2] *Ibid.*, July 7, 1919, p. 19.

[3] *Ibid.*, Aug. 9, 1920, p. 12.

who had "no respect for law or justice," would not suffice to clear the Government. If the Minister of War refused to have an inquiry or attempted to conceal the facts, a terrible injury, he declared, would be inflicted on "the British constitution and the British Empire."[1] During the debate in the House of Commons on the Supplementary Vote for the Royal Irish Constabulary he again took occasion to protest "against the horrible doctrine, that violence should be repelled by violence" which he described "as a competition in crime between the forces of the Crown and the forces of disorder."[2] Letters which he addressed to the *Times* expressed a similar sense of indignation over the use of the armed forces of the Government in raiding towns and villages, in destroying buildings and in "some cases killing persons resident therein." A "searching public inquiry" was again demanded in these communications, one of which was signed jointly with Lord Grey.[3]

It is not to be inferred from what has been said that Lord Robert Cecil was indifferent to the claims of Ulster. At an earlier date he had been an ardent champion of Ulster's rights. This attitude was manifested in a speech before the House of Commons in April, 1914, at which time he protested against the coercion of the people in the north of Ireland.[4] Another speech delivered a month earlier severely criticising the people of South Ireland and their treatment of the soldiers of the Crown together with a defense of those officers who indicated their unwillingness to coerce Protestant Ireland, reveals his position on that critical occasion.[5] Although in the succeeding years Lord Robert's Toryism

[1] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 133:968-969.

[2] The *Times*, March 8, 1921, p. 17.

[3] See the *Times*, Oct. 1, 1920, p. 9; Oct. 14, 1920, p. 10.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 60:1700-1701.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. 60: 262-264.

had diminished and his sense of democracy had become much more pronounced, nevertheless, he continued to voice the claims of Ulster. On 18 May 1920, he offered an amendment proposing that Northern Ireland should "remain in all respects a part of the United Kingdom." This proposal, he explained, was in keeping with his conviction that all "government should be with the consent of the governed." Not only would he apply the principle of self determination to Ulster, but he would also have it applied to the South and West of Ireland. He added that the custom of the past in making the Irish "shut their eyes and open their mouths" and take what the English thought best for them was the cause of all the mischief in that unhappy island.[1] In his pamphlet, *The New Outlook,* he again pointed out the futility of forcing "on Ireland an English solution" of the problem. He proposed in this excellent statement of modern democratic Toryism that the Irish be given the largest amount of self-government possible, consistent with the safety of the Empire. The practical solution which he suggested was that of giving Ireland the status of a Dominion or "a federal constitution with separate treatment for North-East Ulster." He would have a referendum submitted to the people to determine which of these two schemes they preferred and then abide by that decision.[2]

How these proposals, through a combination of circumstances, found a partial fulfillment in the establishment of the Irish Free State is familiar history. Viscount Birkenhead,[3] who was a conspicuous figure in effecting that settlement, remarked that England had come to the tardy conclu-

[1] The *Times,* May 19, 1920, p. 10.

[2] Lord Robert Cecil, *The New Outlook,* p. 41-42.

[3] Lord Birkenhead himself has been described as a Tory Democrat in an article signed "Curio" which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review* as late as Feb. 1923. *Fortnightly Review,* Feb. 1923, p. 190. In this connection it is well to remember that Lord Birkenhead for a number of years represented a very large working-class constituency.

sion that a mistake had been made in the past in solely paying attention to the material needs of Ireland and not enough to those things which are "idealistic and sentimental." Consequently the population had been profoundly dissatisfied. The mistaken policy of the Earl of Sussex in Queen Elizabeth's time had been continued up to the present. This state of affairs was now happily redressed. As a result of the negotiations then going on, he said, there would be "a new partner in the Empire" [1] which would be in much the same position as Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

Among the reforms which have enlisted the concern and interest of a section of the Unionist party during recent years is that of effecting changes in the composition of the House of Lords. It is to be noted, however, that this movement has had the support of many Unionists who could not be properly classified as Tory Democrats. Lord Newton, the Earl of Lansdowne, Mr. Balfour and Mr. Austen Chamberlain have been some of the advocates of changing the character of the Upper House. Furthermore, much of the activity in connection with this constitutional reform was stimulated by the Parliament Act of 1911 or by the contemplation of such a measure.

The Tories, as Lord Lansdowne once said, frankly admitted that there was a grievance. Men of all parties, he declared, were in general agreement that a Second Chamber based on hereditary privileges was an anomaly which commanded neither confidence nor respect.[2] As an alternative to the Parliament Bill which was introduced by the Asquith Government, the Marquis of Lansdowne offered a resolution in 1910 which had as its object the establishment of a stronger and more representative Second Chamber on a more

[1] *The Times*, Dec. 7, 1921, p. 10.

[2] *Glasgow Herald*, Nov. 26, 1910, p. 8.

democratic basis. If his plan had been adopted not more than half of the members of the Hereditary Chamber, as now constituted, would sit in the reformed House and of these only a small proportion would have been selected by their fellow peers. A large proportion would have seats therein because they were qualified by having had official and other experience. Such an arrangement, it was frequently pointed out, would lessen the likelihood of the Upper House being predominantly Unionist. As Lord Lansdowne took pains to explain, his plan would reduce the unwieldy numbers in the Hereditary Chamber and would retain the best elements of the House as then constituted. The members of the reformed House of Lords would be selected either on nomination by the Government of the day or by some form of external elections. The Bill also embodied a plan for settling differences which might arise between the two Houses of Parliament. In the event of the Commons passing a bill twice within an interval of a year and the House of Lords hesitating to accept it, the Lansdowne plan would begin to operate. The two Houses would name delegates to confer and arrange a compromise measure. If the conference failed then the two Houses would meet together and decide by a vote of the whole body on the fate of the proposed bill. In the case of any measure of great importance or seriousness, or any Money Bill, the procedure would be fuller. First, if a far-reaching proposal like a Home Rule Bill or a Disestablishment Bill came up and set one House of Parliament against the other it would be finally determined by a popular vote on the measure. In other words the referendum would be used. In the next place, the Bill provided that the Lords should forego their "right to reject or amend Money Bills which are purely financial in character." If any doubt was to arise as to the nature of a Money Bill a joint committee of both Houses with the speaker in the chair was to decide the point at issue. This

was claimed by its Tory proponents to be a simple and democratic method of arranging any dispute that might develop between the two Houses.[1] It might be noted that these proposals were opposed by the Marquis of Crewe (Liberal) as alarmingly new and impracticable.[2]

Nor was this exhibition of reform altogether in the nature of a death-bed repentance, as Sir John Simon once remarked it was. As early as 1884 drastic action was urged by a progressive Tory writing over the name of "B."[3] Lord Dunraven in 1888 introduced a Bill looking to the reform of the Second Chamber. The most consistent advocate of making needed changes in the composition and prerogatives of the Upper House has been Lord Newton. In 1907 he was active in behalf of a measure which provided that certain qualifications would have to be possessed by a peer to sit in the House of Lords, or that he would have to be elected as a representative peer, his seat being limited to the life of a single Parliament. Speaking in favour of this measure he explained that his proposals were not new but "had been frequently put forward by distinguished members of the House." This Bill was supported by the Earl of Dunraven and, naturally enough, was opposed by Lord Halsbury.[4] Had the voice of Tory Democracy prevailed the more drastic Act of 1911 might have been avoided. But the die-hards persisted and the inevitable in due time followed.

In the General Election of 1910 the Unionists pledged a thorough reform of the House of Lords. Lord Birkenhead in one of his campaign speeches maintained that their scheme affirmed the principles of democracy.[5] Mr. Balfour

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* (Lords) 5th series, vol. 6:838.

[2] *Ibid.,* 849-854.

[3] *The New Conservatism,* by "B", pp. 10-12.

[4] *Annual Register,* 1907, pp. 114-115.

[5] The *Times,* Nov. 24, 1910, p. 9.

favoured the reform throughout the campaign. He expressed the opinion that the people wanted a Second Chamber but were opposed to keeping it in the form which at that time obtained. Mr. Bonar Law, in an election speech in Glasgow, said that his party, if returned, "intended to reform the House of Lords and bring it into direct touch with the people of the country." [1]

During recent years Lord Newton has resumed his efforts to bring to fruition the plans which he has long advocated. Speaking on a Bill which provided for the reduction of a number of peers in the Upper House, he said that should the measure be enacted, half of the members would never be aware of the fact, and those remaining would not be conscious that they had left their midst. The House of Lords, he remarked, was in a swollen and bloated condition. He quoted with approval the criticism made by Lord Salisbury to the effect that the members were all drawn from one class.[2] In many of the more recent speeches on the subject it is quite obvious that the spectre of a Labour Government was present. The Labour Party, according to Lord Newton, had a grievance against the House of Lords, which in his opinion was not to be wondered at.[3] In March, 1923, he was again urging the reform of the Upper Chamber. If his plan should be realized the House would be reduced by having the peers elect a limited number from their own class. His proposals were supported by Lord Curzon.[4] Lord Robert Cecil has also been an advocate of effecting a reform by substituting "an elective for the hereditary basis." He has recommended that these elections be performed by Local Government bodies.[5]

[1] *Glasgow Herald,* Nov. 25, 1910, p. 10.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates,* (Lords) 5th series, vol. 53:542.

[3] *Ibid.,* vol. 51:677.

[4] The *Times* (weekly edition), March 23, 1923, p, 320.

[5] *The New Outlook,* p. 35.

Not only would Lord Robert have changes effected with respect to the Second Chamber but in his opinion the growing abuses in the House of Commons during recent years should receive serious consideration. "No reform," he writes, "is more urgently necessary than the rehabilitation of Parliament." [1] He was severely critical of Mr. Lloyd George's arbitrary and irresponsible methods during the days following the World War, at which time the Coalition Government showed but scant consideration for the prerogatives of the popular House. The Prime Minister seemed to be more concerned in having the support of the press than of the House of Commons, as Mr. Gardiner explained in his article, "The Twilight of Parliament." [2] Lord Robert declared that Parliament "scarcely counted at all." Legislation was arranged "behind the back of the House" and forced through the various legislative stages without any pretense of consulting the will of the members. This method of riding "roughshod over all Parliamentary institutions," in his opinion, was destructive of representative government. While such a procedure may have been justified during the war there was no excuse, he maintained, for its continuance after the exigencies of that period had passed.[3]

A growing custom which Lord Robert regarded with disfavour was the habit of the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the Cabinet in absenting themselves from the House when most important matters were being discussed. Speaking in the House of Commons in April, 1914 on the Government of Ireland Bill he complained that the House had been treated with increasing disrespect by the Ministry, the culmination of which was reached when the Cabinet Minister who was in charge of the Bill did not consider it necessary

[1] *The New Outlook*, p. 32.

[2] *Atlantic Monthly*, 1921 (vol. 128), pp. 248-255.

[3] Lord Robert Cecil, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

" to be present for a single hour of the Debate." [1] The Coalition Government was condemned for a similar indifference in waiting until the last day of the session before they presented a review of their industrial policy. Parliament, he went on to say, was not there to listen to what the Minister told the newspapers or Trade Union Congresses but its business was " to debate and discuss." The cavalier attitude of Mr. Lloyd George's Administration towards the House during the legislative stages of the Profiteering Bill was referred to as one of the several instances " in which the Government . . . over and over again appeared to consider Parliament as the instrument for carrying out the policy of the Cabinet and indeed of the Prime Minister." That, he went on to say, " is not the Constitution under which we live, and it is not a Constitution that can be made to work in this country. Unless you preserve in the minds of the people of this country the prestige of Parliament, you really have no answer to direct action." [2] This same neglect and indifference was pointed out in connection with the Government's treatment of the League of Nations. While they constantly protested " in the warmest language their respect for the League " he said " they almost always failed to do anything . . . the Prime Minister having decided what should or should not be done." [3] Lord Henry Cavendish Bentinck made a similar protest when he remarked that " the House of Commons, however empty and however dull the debates might be, did serve as a sounding board for the nation." [4] Mr. E. Wood, another of the advanced Tories of recent times, has also deplored " the extent to which the

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 60:1698.

[2] *Ibid.,* vol. 119:2031.

[3] The *Times,* May 28, 1921, p. 6.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 117:686.

House of Commons is tending to become a legislative assembly registering the executive decrees of Government." [1]

Among those Conservatives who actively identified themselves with the forces of progress and democracy during the World War, and the period of transition and reconstruction which followed, was Mr. Balfour, who, during the latter stage of his career, returned to the principles which he had exhibited at its outset as a member of the Fourth party. Whenever he spoke of the war his biographer relates that "it was its 'democratic' character that he emphasized." [2] Mr. Walter H. Page in one of his letters as British Ambassador to President Wilson remarked: "Mr. Balfour is a Tory and in general I don't like Tories, yet liberal he surely is—a sort of high-toned Scotch Democrat." [3] His visit to America in 1917 and his various speeches at that time expressed a real appreciation of a genuine democracy; and the success of the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armaments was largely assured by reason of the generous spirit of co-operation which Mr. Balfour displayed throughout the proceedings.

Another Conservative, who, during the post-War period, has displayed the spirit of Tory Democracy, is Mr. Ormsby Gore, the Under Secretary of State for Colonies in the Bonar Law and Baldwin Governments. The question of public health in the Colonies and the desirability of the British Government undertaking a work similar to that of the United States in Cuba and Porto Rico is one of the reforms which he has urged in the House of Commons.[4] His interest in housing legislation, in maternity benefits and

[1] Lloyd and Wood, *The Great Opportunity* (London, 1919), p. 32.

[2] E. T. Raymond, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

[3] B. J. Hendrick, *Life and Letters of Walter Hines Page* (New York, 1922), vol. ii, p. 257.

[4] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 156:260.

in the success of the Tuberculosis Bill in 1921 displayed a similar concern for the health of the population at home.[1] His attitude towards international affairs has likewise been marked by the spirit of progressiveness. Speaking on the motion of Mr. Barnes (Labour) to ratify the conventions of the International Labour Conference at Washington (1919) he criticised the Coalition Government for being "if anything more reactionary than the Governments before the war." He protested against a policy which denied full and open discussion of foreign questions in the House of Commons. These matters, he said, were openly debated in the legislative assemblies of Australia and Canada and the same rule might well apply at Westminster. He suggested that the growing habit of treating the members of Parliament "as children" was due to the fact that the Foreign Secretary was a "Noble Lord who" lived "entirely in the dark ages."[2] Other utterances which reflect the ideas of the younger Tories of the present day might be quoted. Mr. Gore's speech in the House of Commons, for instance, on the Zionist Movement and the anti-Semitic politics which obtained in certain quarters of Europe, reveal a fine type of international ethics.[3]

Mr. Edward Wood, the President of the Board of Education in the Unionist Government of 1923, is another of the progressive Tories. In a small volume entitled *The Great Opportunity,* which was written jointly with Captain Sir George Lloyd and which appeared in 1919, the more advanced point of view is set forth. Although the message of these authors is couched in moderate terms, nevertheless, the principles which are proposed in connection with hous-

[1] The *Times,* April 14, 1921, p. 14.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 142:512.

[3] *Ibid.,* vol. 156:263-265.

ing,[1] education,[2] the drink traffic[3] and other current problems are akin to the best ideals of Tory Democracy.

Mr. J. St. Loe Strachey must also be regarded as a potent force on the side of those who demand a forward-looking programme for the Unionist party. Under his brilliant, vigorous and courageous editorship, the *Spectator,* in marked contrast with its policy during the days of Lord Randolph Churchill, has moved more and more in recent years towards the Tory democratic position. Mr. Strachey performed much the same service, following his party's reversal in 1923, as Sir Fabian Ware did in the columns of the *Morning Post* after the Unionist collapse in 1905. A few references to some of Mr. Strachey's articles will suffice to indicate his attitude. Just before a meeting of the Unionist party in February, 1924, for the purpose of selecting a leader, he insisted that in addition to the right kind of leadership "there must be a change of heart in the party" whose ideals must be "at once Conservative and democratic." As for the die-hards, if they resisted, the party had best lose them.[4] Discussing the proper programme for the party to adopt in the critical period following the defeat of 1923, he insisted that it must be constructive, aggressive and democratic. Otherwise the Unionist party would cease to live. "Above all the Conservative Democratic party must not be afraid to trust the people," wrote Mr. Strachey. "They are our masters. We are their servants" he added.[5] "A comprehensive and bold policy of social reform" should be undertaken. Furthermore, that policy "must not be timid, or

[1] Captain Sir George Lloyd and Major the Hon. Edward Wood, M. P., *The Great Opportunity,* pp. 80, 82.

[2] *Ibid.,* pp. 89, 91, 95.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 86.

[4] The *Spectator,* Feb. 2, 1924, p. 148.

[5] *Ibid.,* Jan. 26, 1924, p. 116.

perfunctory, or pedantic," was the advice he ventured to give on another occasion.[1] In the *Spectator* of 2 August 1924, Mr. Strachey's position became still more pronounced. No less than four contributions appeared at that time dealing with " the rankest evils " of the party, which if not remedied, would render the remaining days of the Unionists " short and precarious." [2] In a leader written by himself he asked the Unionist chiefs to " realize that almost all the young men " of the party and many of the older members wanted a dynamic policy of " action and development." They were " not content with the world as it is " and they wanted their leaders to share some of the same sense of " divine discontent." The section of the party for which he spoke refused " to live on a category of negatives." Addressing the " Magnates of the Carlton," who shook their heads gravely and dubiously when presented with comprehensive plans for solving the urgent social and industrial problems of the hour, he wrote: " You might demand that the credit of the nation should be used to reduce unemployment and to endow us with good houses, good roads and cheap power, and smokeless skies; but instead, you twitter in the corner about the dangers of big schemes." He declared that they were letting their " rivals appropriate and wear what might have been " their own clothes while they were hesitating " as to whether this or that point in the cut " was becoming. He was impatient with maintaining a position of *non possumus* and like many others felt that it was " better to stand aside from party politics altogether than to endorse action so futile and so inept." [3]

In a review of Mr. Begbie's volume, *The Conservative*

[1] The *Spectator*, Feb. 16, 1924, p. 236.

[2] *Ibid.*, Aug. 2, 1924, p. 149.

[3] *Ibid.*, Aug. 2, 1924, p. 152.

Mind,[1] he took occasion to attack anew the indifferent leadership of the Unionist party. He was severely critical of Mr. Begbie's book because it revealed a spirit which seemed entirely too complacent. He found himself, however, in agreement with the author's contention that "the historic basis of Conservatism is a close human and individual sympathy with Labour; the historic basis of Liberalism is a passion for abstract ideas."[2] In this same issue of the *Spectator* (2 August 1924), Mr. Strachey emphatically endorsed a lengthy communication which was printed under the caption of "The Young Conservative and The State of the Party" in which the writer complained of those Unionist leaders who worshipped "at the shrine of the God of things as they are." The correspondent who was "a member of an old and respected Conservative family—and a would-be candidate," as Mr. Strachey explained, demanded that the wage earner should be given "as good a chance of obtaining political distinction in the Conservative Party as in the Labour Party." If the Conservative leaders got "into touch with the needs and feelings of the individual workers" and addressed themselves to "definite schemes" for dealing with housing, national insurance, unemployment and the other pressing problems of the country, they would "then no longer have such wishy-washy pronouncements on" these questions as had appeared "in the recently published statement of Conservative aims." Mr. Strachey, in his final comment on these views, exclaimed: "Down with the 'Better Nots' and up with the 'Go-aheads' must be our watch-word."[3]

No Unionist of late has so completely identified himself

[1] *The Conservative Mind,* By A Gentleman With A Duster. (London, 1924).

[2] The *Spectator,* Aug. 2, 1924, p. 163.

[3] *Ibid.,* pp. 158-159.

with the new political and social programme as Viscount Milner. His indifference, however, to party lines makes it somewhat difficult to classify him. Although nominally a Unionist he has veered so close to the Labour party that he was mentioned as a possible member of the MacDonald Ministry which was formed in January, 1924. Speaking in 1920 on the subject of his party affiliation he denied that he was a "Labour man" or a "Labour member." He added that he was regarded as belonging to a school which was quite the opposite. He admitted, however, that he had much in common with the Labour party and that he did "not look with dislike on the prospect of Labour Governments whether in boroughs, cities or countries." In his opinion it was inevitable that they would come to power in England and when in office would probably make mistakes. But he remarked that he had known other Governments to "occasionally make mistakes." He then proceeded as follows: "I do not think for a moment that they will be less public spirited, less anxious to do the right thing, less keen about the progress of the various communities over which they preside than Governments of other classes have been." [1]

His remarks on imperial affairs have displayed a similar catholicity. Speaking in the House of Lords on the subject of Egypt he said that all former declarations of England's policy would have to be regarded as insincere and hypocritical unless the status of an independent state in intimate alliance with Great Britain was granted.[2] This plea in behalf of "Egyptian patriots," who want a "recognized nationality" of their own and "a place in the sun," as he once remarked,[3] together with his severe condemnation of the methods employed by General Dyer in connection with the Amritsar

[1] The *Times*, Nov. 23, 1920, p. 9.

[2] *Ibid.*, Dec. 6, 1920, p. 11.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates* (Lords), 5th series, vol. 42:209-213.

riots [1]—these and similar utterances are hardly in accord with the public opinion entertained towards Lord Milner when he was a "prancing proconsul" in South Africa. His criticism of that part of the Versailles Treaty which transferred to Italy part of the Tyrol "occupied by a purely German people," [2] his generous appeal in behalf of Austria [3] and his expressed conviction that Bulgaria should "have a good commercial access to the Aegean" [4] are characterized by the same temper as his references to Egypt and India.

Lord Milner's interest in social questions has likewise revealed a very modern point of view, as has been indicated elsewhere. He has described himself as an "advanced social reformer," [5] a designation which is peculiarly appropriate. As early as 1907 he was urging the Unionist party to adopt a more aggressive programme of social and economic reform. In a speech before the Surrey Unionist Association in October of that year he said that the party should not be content to attack socialism and neglect to remove those economic evils which honest socialism was striving to eradicate. For the Unionists to pursue such a policy, would be, in his opinion, utterly unworthy of "its own best traditions from the days of *Sybil* and *Coningsby* to the present time." The true antidote to revolutionary socialism, he declared, was practical social reform. The best way to prevent violent changes and maintain the institutions of the country, he said, was to remove the causes of social misery. Referring to the Liberal legislative activities after assuming office in 1906, he declared that it was a mistake for Unionists to make a present to their political enemies of a programme including

[1] *Parliamentary Debates* (Lords), 5th series, vol. 41:311-318.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 39:927.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 920.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. 39:920.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. 53:894.

old-age pensions, good housing, the physical training of the people, continuation schools and the "multiplication of small land-owners." "These are objects," he added, "for which the Unionists have as good a right to strive as any one."[1] Lord Milner's addresses on the sweated industries[2] and his advanced pronouncements in favour of a greater degree of State management and ownership of shipping, food, coal and other necessities,[3] together with his support of the Liquor (Popular Control) Act, because it embodied "for the first time in a Bill introduced into Parliament the principle of public ownership and control of the liquor traffic,"[4] as well as many other speeches of the same sort, testify to the nature of his interest in the social problems of his day.

Another Unionist of recent times, who has typified the ideals and purposes of Tory Democracy, is Mr. Alfred Lyttelton who was the intimate friend of Mr. Balfour. Frequently referred to as representing all that is best in the English gentleman, he was actively identified with those political and social reforms which were engaging the attention of the more progressive and humane leaders of the country during the pre-War period. Mention has already been made of his efforts in connection with the evils of the sweating system. He maintained a sympathetic interest in various phases of social betterment being actively engaged in the work of Cambridge House, Toynbee Hall and other centres of social service. His lectures before the Working Men's College reveal the scope of his interests, which, according to the *Spectator,* were quickened at an early age by the readings of Maurice and Ruskin.[5] In later life his cath-

[1] *Unionist Leaflet,* no. 118, p. 3.

[2] *Speeches and Addresses of Viscount Milner,* p. 254.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates* (Lords), 5th series, vol. 35:684.

[4] *Ibid.,* vol. 45:1121-1126.

[5] The *Spectator,* July 12, 1913, p. 49.

olicity and breadth of outlook led him to the study and appreciation of Mr. Sidney Webb and the Fabian literature.[1] In Parliament he displayed a friendly attitude towards the Liberal Government's House and Town Planning Bill of 1909 as well as their proposals for Labour Exchanges and the establishment of Trade Boards with power to establish wages in the sweating and similar industries.[2]

During the pre-War days he was frequently active in behalf of the woman's suffrage movement, his parliamentary record showing that he consistently favoured the cause. In January, 1913, he moved an amendment which had for its object the extension of the franchise to the women. Speaking in support of his Bill he described the many services performed by women in serving on Royal Commissions which had to do with the nation's most difficult problems. He considered their aid invaluable in dealing with public health, the minimum wage, the hours of labour and the many similar questions which were increasingly demanding the attention of Parliament. His rather lengthy speech covered the various aspects of the question including a word in extenuation of the militant suffragists.[3]

Among those Unionists who favoured this constitutional reform were Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Wyndham, Lord Henry Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, Mr. Ormsby Gore and many others. Lord Robert Cecil has also been friendly to the cause. In 1908 he protested because women were imprisoned simply because they attempted "to enforce what they considered to be their political rights."[4] He was naturally favourable to the Represen-

[1] Edith Lyttelton, *Alfred Lyttelton, An Account of His Life Work*, p. 175.

[2] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 9:1868-1869.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. 47:882-889.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. 184:286.

tation of the People Act of 1918. Shortly after its enactment he was largely responsible for carrying a resolution permitting women to sit in the House of Commons. If Parliament was to be truly representative of the people, he maintained that it was essential "that it should contain some exponents of woman's point of view."[1] For the same reason he advocated women having a place in the House of Lords. In a speech supporting the extension of the franchise to women under thirty years of age, he declared that he hoped for the removal of all "distinction between men and women in public affairs."[2] A few years later he gave further evidence of his belief in this principle when he spoke in support of a resolution by Major Hills (Unionist) which would admit women to the civil service on the same terms as men. This proposal, which, of course, was upheld by Viscountess Astor and opposed by Sir Frederick Banbury, elicited from Lord Robert Cecil the opinion that women should have the same opportunities as men in the public service including "equal pay for equal service."[3]

The position of Lord Robert Cecil with respect to women's rights is only one of a score of instances which indicate the enlightened attitude he has sustained towards the more recent problems of Great Britain. He has been peculiarly alive to the unprecedented situation which has developed during and since the Great War and has evinced a readiness to adopt new and bold methods in dealing with that situation. On more than one occasion he has come to the support of proposals brought forward by Labour members in the House of Commons. In fact, at one time the London press seriously discussed the possibility of Lord Robert formally identifying himself with that group. As early as 1914 the

[1] New York *Times*, Nov. 6, 1919, p. 13.

[2] The *Times*, July 5, 1919, p. 16.

[3] *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol. 145:1934.

Labour member, Mr. Goldstone, remarked that the Labour party had hopes of Lord Robert joining their ranks, "notwithstanding his title;" [1] and the Labour leader, Mr. Henderson, made the statement in 1920 that his party "regarded Lord Robert as an ally." [2] Lord Robert rather countenanced these expressions of comradeship, when in the course of a speech in June, 1920, he observed that "there were in the Labour party some men of wide vision and moderate thought who might well be trusted in any position of responsibility." [3] He qualified this assertion, however, by referring to some of the extreme Labour elements which he did not consider so trustworthy.

The appearance of his pamphlet in 1919, entitled *The New Outlook,* which was in the nature of a manifesto, strengthened the belief that the Unionist party was too cramped and limited for his very liberal political and social tendencies. The *Nation and the Athenaeum,* in commenting on his manifesto, declared that it was "ridiculous to call" him "a Tory or an aristocrat." The views which he held, in the opinion of this periodical, identified him with Mill, Wilson and to some extent with Jaurès and Robert Owen. The article then proceeded to comment on his near approach to the British Labour movement.[4] The same publication in an earlier discussion of *The New Outlook* expressed the opinion that its author was not far removed from the "mind of the moderate section of the Labour Party though he nowhere verged on Socialism." [5]

But Lord Robert quieted all these speculations as to his political status by flatly asserting that he had no thought of

[1] *Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 60:1706.

[2] The *Times,* Jan. 14, 1920, p. 9.

[3] *Ibid.,* June 21, 1920, p. 5.

[4] The *Nation and Athenaeum,* 1922 (vol. 31), p. 142.

[5] *The Nation,* 1920 (vol. 26), p. 501.

leaving the Tory organization. At a meeting of the Council of the Hitchin Division of the Conservative Associations he assured his constituents that "he had not the slightest idea of joining the Labour Party and that if he had such an idea he did not think there was the slightest chance of them taking him in." [1] His presence in the Baldwin Cabinet in 1923 indicated clearly enough what his party affiliations really were.

Although his pronounced, if not extreme, democratic tendencies have been decidedly conspicuous in recent years, patches of Toryism are still discernible. His readiness on all occasions to defend the established rights of the Anglican Church reveals this aspect of his political character. Speaking as late as May, 1922, he averred that he had "great admiration for the old Conservative party," or, as he liked to characterize it, "the old country party." He recalled that in the old days it did not adopt "a merely negative conservatism." He added that "it was not afraid of change in the right direction," nor "was it a mere bulwark of the propertied classes and nothing else." He then proceeded to express his regret, in terms not dissimilar to those employed by Lord Randolph Churchill a generation before, that those who had secured control of the party machinery "had moved very far from the Conservative traditions." The section of the party which was then dominant, he went on to say, seemed to be exclusively concerned with "the preservation of its property and to have largely lost its great ideals of public service." [2] While these remarks must be attributed partly to an impatience with a temporary situation they nevertheless serve to show how this Cecilian embodies in a peculiar degree everything which is associated with the idea of Tory Democracy.

[1] The *Times*, March 21, 1921, p. 7.

[2] *Ibid.*, May 13, 1922, p. 16, ch. iv.

He has realized the need of pursuing a progressive policy in order to prevent those violent changes which might threaten the institutions of the country. This is the thought which he brought to the attention of Parliament during the debates in connection with the recommendations of the International Labour Conference at Washington on which occasion he took the Government to task for its failure to act on the proposals which had been submitted for ratification. Protesting because of the inaction displayed he declared that "the best answer they could give to the working people, who were told that they could not trust their present Governments, and that they must look to revolutionary methods to attain their ends, was to show that those ideals could be attained on constitutional lines."[1] A month before, while speaking in support of Mr. G. Barnes (Labour) who was criticising the Government for its continued inaction with respect to the conventions of the Washington Labour Conference, he sounded a similar note of warning and advice. He stated that in England and throughout Europe the people had "grave misgivings" respecting "the wisdom of those who were the governing classes before 1914." That distrust, he suggested, would not be allayed by exhibitons of indifference to such a matter of importance as was then before the House.[2] It has been quite characteristic of Lord Robert's policy to urge those in power to realize the serious demands of the times and act before it is too late. He sees the danger which will befall the country if either the reactionaries or the revolutionaries secure control.

The same breadth of vision and boldness of thought which have distinguished this Tory leader in domestic affairs have likewise been in evidence with respect to the great inter-

[1] The *Times*, July 2, 1921, p. 16.

[2] *Ibid.*, May 28, 1921, p. 6.

national questions of recent times. His utterances on the subject of armaments,[1] and his desire for the success of the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armaments,[2] his timely and courageous advice with respect to reparations,[3] his attitude towards the situation as it existed in Silesia in 1921[4] and in the Ruhr two years later,[5] his opposition to England's interference in the internal affairs of Russia in 1919,[6] his rebuke of both England and France for failing to abide by the promises given Armenia during the war,[7] and above all, his efforts in behalf of the League of Nations —these and other public services constitute a new and creditable chapter in the history of Tory Democracy. The best traditions of the Toryism of both Disraeli and Lord Randolph Churchill have been sustained and brought to a more complete fulfillment in the person of Lord Robert Cecil, who has identified himself, not only with those forces which seek "to improve the condition of the people" of his own country but which are also striving to inaugurate a new and enlightened international order.

[1] *Cf.* the *Times,* Dec. 29, 1920, p. 8.

[2] *Cf. ibid.,* Nov. 15, 1921, p. 5.

[3] *Cf. ibid.,* Nov. 29, 1921, p. 15.

[4] *Cf. ibid.,* May 12, 1921, p. 9.

[5] *Cf., Parliamentary Debates,* 5th series, vol. 160:389-391.

[6] *Cf.,* the *Times,* July 30, 1919, p. 16.

[7] *Cf. ibid.,* March 8, 1922, p. 17.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"B." *The New Conservatism* (pamphlet), London, 1884.

Barnett, Mrs. H. O., *Canon Barnett, His Life, Work and Friends*, 2 vols., London, 1919.

Beard, Charles A., *An Introduction to the English Historians*, New York, 1906.

Bentinck, Lord Henry, *Tory Democracy*, London, 1918.

Boscawen, A. S. T. Griffith, *Fourteen Years in Parliament*, London, 1907.

Bourke, R., A speech printed in pamphlet form by the Leeds Conservative Association. Leeds, n. d.

Butler, G. G. G., *The Tory Tradition*, London, 1914.

Cambridge Modern History, vol. xii, New York, 1910.

Campaign Guide, London, 1914, 1922.

Chamberlain, Joseph, *Speeches of Joseph Chamberlain*, edited by C. W. Boyd, 2 vols., London, 1914.

Chamberlain, Joseph, *Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's Speeches*, edited by H. W. Lucy, London, 1885.

Cecil, Lady Gwendolen, *Life of Robert Marquis of Salisbury*, 2 vols., London, 1921.

Cecil, Lord Hugh, *Conservatism*, London, 1919.

Cecil, Lord Robert, *The New Outlook*, London, 1919.

Cheyney, E. P., *Industrial and Social History of England*, revised edition, New York, 1920.

Churchill, Lady Randolph, *Reminiscences*, London, 1908.

Churchill, Lord Randolph, *Speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill*, edited by Louis J. Jennings, M. P., 2 vols., London and New York, 1889.

Churchill, W. S., *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, 2 vols., New York, 1906.

De Morgan's Tracts for the Times. A letter to the Right Hon. Earl of Beaconsfield, sixth edition, Leeds, printed and published by De Morgan and Co., Leeds, 1880.

Dicey, A. V., *Lectures on the Relation between Law and Public Opinion in England in the Nineteenth Century*, London, 1905.

Disraeli, Benjamin, *Coningsby*, London, 1871.

——, *Contarini Fleming*, London, 1871.

——, *Endymion*, London, 1871.

——, *Sybil or the Two Nations*, London, 1871.

——, *Tancred*, London, 1871.

——, *Whigs and Whiggism*, London, 1913.
The Pocket Disraeli, compiled by J. B. Lindenbaum, London, 1912.
Selected Speeches of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, edited by T. E. Kebbel, 2 vols., London, 1882.
The Wisdom of Disraeli, or A Great Policy for a Great Party, arranged by T. Comyn Platt with a preface by the Marquess of Salisbury, London, 1920.
Dolan, Winifred, *The History of Social Reform During a Hundred Years*, London, 1905.
Encyclopedia Britannica, 12th edition.
Escott, T. H. S., *Randolph Spencer Churchill as a Product of his Age Being a Personal and Political Monograph*, London, 1895.
Feiling, Kieth, *Toryism*, London, 1910.
Greenwood, Arthur, *Richard Oastler "The Factory King,"* Huddersfield, 1913.
Gretton, R. H., *A Modern History of the English People, 1880-1910*, 2 vols., London, 1913.
Gorst, Harold, *Earl of Beaconsfield*, London, 1900.
——, *The Fourth Party*, London, 1906.
Hayes, Carlton, J. H., *British Social Politics*, Boston, 1913.
Hazell's *Annual and Almanac*.
Hearnshaw, F. J. C., *Democracy at the Crossways*, London, 1918.
Hendrick, B. J., *Life and Letters of Walter Hines Page*, 2 vols., New York, 1922.
Hobhouse, L. T., *Liberalism*, London, 1911.
Holland, Bernard, *Life of the Duke of Devonshire*, 2 vols., London, 1911.
Hope, James F., *A History of the 1900 Parliament*, London, 1908.
Howell, George, *A Handy Book of the Labour Laws*, London, 1894.
Hunt, William, *The Political History of England, 1760-1801*, London and New York, 1905.
Hutchins, B. L. and Harrison, A., *A History of Factory Legislation*, 2nd edition revised, London, 1911.
Jeyes, S. H., *Life and Times of the Marquis of Salisbury*, 4 vols., London, 1895-1896.
Lang, Andrew, *Life, Letters and Diaries of Sir Stafford Northcote, First Earl of Iddesleigh*, 2 vols., Edinburgh and London, 1890.
Licensing Question, London, 1904.
Low, Sidney and Sanders, L. C., *The Political History of England, 1837-1901*, London and New York, 1913.
Lowell, A. Lawrence, *The Government of England*, new edition, 2 vols., New York, 1921.
Lloyd, Captain Sir George and Wood, Major the Hon. Edward, *The Great Opportunity*, London, 1919.
Lucas, Reginald, *Lord Glenesk and the Morning Post*, London, 1910.

Lucy, H. W., *A Diary of the Salisbury Parliament*, London, 1892.
——, *Memories of Eight Parliaments*, London, 1908.
Lyttelton, E., *Alfred Lyttelton, An Account of His Life*, London, 1917.
Mackintosh, Alexander, *Joseph Chamberlain, an Honest Biography*, new edition, London, 1914.
——, *From Disraeli to Lloyd George*, London, 1921.
McCarthy, Justin, *A History of Our Own Times*, 3 vols., New York and London, 1903.
Manners, Lord John, *England's Trust and Other Poems*, London, 1841.
Martin, A. Patchett, *Life of Lord Sherbrooke*, London, 1893.
Milner, Viscount and others, *Life of Joseph Chamberlain* (a co-operative work), London, 1914.
Milner, Viscount, *Speeches and Addresses of Viscount Milner*, London, 1913.
Monypenny, William F. and Buckle, George E., *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*, 6 vols., New York, 1910-1920.
Montgomery, Hugh and Cambray, Philip G., *Dictionary of Political Phrases and Allusions*, London, 1906.
Morley, John, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, 3 vols., London, 1903.
Muir, Ramsay, *A Short History of the British Commonwealth*, 2 vols., London, 1922.
National Toryism, a pamphlet by an anonymous writer printed for private circulation, London, 1911.
National Unionist Leaflets (published by the National Union of Conservative Associations).
Norma, G. W., *A Political Humbug or Half an Hour With Lord Randolph Churchill*, London, 1885.
O'Connor, T. P., *Lord Beaconsfield: A Biography*, 7th edition, London, 1896.
Oman, C. W., *England in the Nineteenth Century*, New York, 1923.
Orth, S. P., *Socialism and Democracy in Europe*, New York, 1913.
Ostrogorski, M., *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, translated from the French by Frederick Clarke, 2 vols., New York, 1902.
Park, Joseph H., *The English Reform Bill of 1867*, New York, 1920.
Parliamentary Debates, Papers and the *Reports* of Commisions and Committees.
Paul, H. W., *A History of Modern England*, 5 vols., New York, 1904-1906.
Plain Tory, A., *Tory Democracy and Unionist Policy*, London, 1892.
Penn, A. W., *Modern England*, London, 1908.
Periodicals and newspapers:
Atlantic Monthly.

Blackwood's Magazine.
Birmingham *Daily Post.*
Bromley District Times.
Christian Commonwealth.
Contemporary Review.
Daily Chronicle.
Daily Graphic.
Daily News and Leader.
Daily Telegraph.
Dublin Review.
Edinburgh Review.
Fortnightly Review.
Forum.
Glasgow Herald.
Independent.
Justice.
Littell's Living Age.
Liverpool Daily Post.
Manchester Courier.
Manchester Guardian.
Morning Post.
National Review.
New York Times.
Nineteenth Century.
North British Review.
Pall Mall Gazette.
Popular Science Monthly.
Quarterly Review.
Review of Reviews (New York).
Saturday Review.
Staffordshire Sentinel.
Standard.
Spectator.
Scotsman.
Times.
Times (Weekly edition).
Westminster Review.

Raymond, E. T., *A Life of Arthur James Balfour,* London, 1920.

Rees, Sir J. D., *Current Political Problems,* London, 1912.

Report of the Papers and Discussion No. 2 of the Cambridge Meeting of the Anthropological Institute.

Roberts, Harry, *Constructive Conservatism* (pamphlet), London, 1913.

Robertson, William, *Life and Times of John Bright,* 2 vols., new edition, London, 1912.

Rose, Frank H., *The Coming Force*, London, 1909.
Rosebery, Lord, *Lord Randolph Churchill*, London, 1906.
——, *Miscellanies, Literary and Historical*, 2 vols., London, 1921.
Russell, Lady John, *A Memoir*, London, 1910.
Salisbury, Marquis of, *The Conservative Programme* (a speech printed in pamphlet form by J. Wighton and Co.), London, 1885.
Slater, Gilbert, *The Making of Modern England*, new revised edition, Boston and New York, 1915.
Smith, F. E., *Unionist Policy*, London, 1913.
Statutes of The Realm.
Strachey, J. St. Loe, *Economics of the Hour*, London, 1923.
Sidebotham, Herbert, *Political Profiles*, Boston and New York, 1921.
Traill, H. D. and Mann, J. S., *Social England*, 6 vols., London, 1904.
Tillyard, Frank, *The Worker and the State*, London, 1923.
Ward, Thomas Humphrey, editor, *The Reign of Queen Victoria* (a co-operative work), 2 vols., London, 1887.
What Unionists Have Done for the Workers (National Unionist booklet, No. 1818), London, n. d.
West, Sir Algernon Edward, *Private Diaries of the Rt. Hon. Sir Algernon West*, London, 1922.

INDEX

Acts of Parliament—
Agricultural Holdings (1900), 206
Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (1899), 213
Allotment (1887), 205-206; (1891), 206
Artisans Dwelling (1868), 176-177; (1874), 55, 177-178; (1878), 178; (1879), 178; (1885), 229; (1890), 230-231; (1899), 231; (1900), 231-233
Ashbourne (1885), 209
Buildings Societies (1874), 183
Children's Half Time (1884), 168
Coal Mines (1911), (1912), 269
Co-operative Societies (1852), 173; (1876), 183; (1887), (1889), 201
Conciliation (1867), 175; (1896), 470
Congested Districts (Scotland) (1897), 231
Conspiracy (1859), 173; (1875), 174-175
Education (1870), 215; (1876), 55, 183, 215: (1890), 216; (1891), 216-217; (1897), 218. (1898), 218; (1899), 218-219; (1900), (1901), 219; (1902), 219-222; (1903), 222
Employers' Liability (1880), 8, 9, 140, 194-195
Employers' and Workmen's (1875), 37, 174
Factory (1802), 165; (1866), 36, 173; (1867), 173-174; (1874), 55, 178-179; (1878), 179-180; (1889), 187; (1891), 186-187; (1901), 187-189
Friendly Savings (1875), 183-184; (1876), 184
Friendly Societies (1896), (1898), (1902), 201
Glebe Lands (1888), 206
Housing and Town Planning (1909), 259
Ireland Development Grant (1903), 213
Land Purchase (Ireland), (1887), (1891), 210; (1895), 211; (1896), 212; (1903), 213-214
Land Transfer (1897), 206
Licensing (1902), (1903), (1904), 205
Light Railways (1889), 210
Local Government (1888), 100, 204; (Ireland), (1898), 212-213
Lodging Houses (1851), 176
Marine (Ireland), (1902), 213
Master and Servant (1867), 163, 174
Merchant Shipping (1876), 55, 180-181; (1887), 182, (1888), 182; (1889), 182-183; (1890), 183; (1892), 183
Metropolitan Open Spaces (1887), 225; (1890), 226
Miners Eight Hour (1892), 192
Mines Regulation (1842), 168; (1850), 173; (1886), 191; (1887), 191-192; (1892), 192; (1900), 193
National Insurance (1911), 254-258
Public Baths (1878), 176
Public Health (1867), (1868), (1875), 55, 175-176; (1888), (1890), (1891), 226; (1896), 226-227; (1897), 227
Public Works Loan (1879), 178
Pure Food (1887), 225; (1899), 227
Railways (1921), 272
Regulation of Railways (1889), 193; (1893), 193; (1900), 193-194
Shop Assistants (1899), 189
Small Holdings (1892), 206

Technical Instruction (1889), 217
Ten Hours', 37, 54; (1847), 168
Truck (1887), 202
Unemployed Workmen's (1905), 200
Unionist Shop Hour's Regulation (1886), 189; (1892), 189
Voluntary Schools (1897), 217-218
Workmen's Compensation (897), 196-197. (1900), 197-198; (1906), 198
Workshops (1867), 174
Alabama claims, 58
Amery, L. C., 258
Arabi Pasha, 70
Arnold, Matthew, 135
Asquith, Herbert, 187, 192
Astor, Viscountess, 266, 300
Atwood, Charles, 52

Baillie, Alexander, 29
Balfour, Lord (Arthur Balfour), 71, 72-73, 81, 95, 101, 105, 144, 145, 158, 160, 195, 197, 206, 209-211, 214, 220, 227-229, 236, 237, 244-245, 248, 251, 254, 285, 287-288, 291, 299
Balfour, Gerald, 212
Balkan States, 68, 119
Banbury, Sir Frederick, 245, 266, 300
Barker, J. Ellis, 250
Barlow, M., 250
Barnes, G., 272, 292, 303
Bathurst, C., 260
Baumann, A. A., 8, 48
Beaconsfield, Earl of (See Disraeli)
Bell, E. F. M., 257
Bentinck, Lord Henry Cavendish, 208, 255, 256, 260, 263, 264-266, 269, 271, 275-281, 290, 299
Bledisloe, Lord, 234n
Blunt, Wilfrid Scawen, 9, 109-110
Boer War, 239-240
Bolingbroke, Viscount, 17, 19-20
Boscawen, Sir A. Griffith, 259, 261, 266, 299
Bowles, Gibson, 249
Bradlaugh, C., 66
Broderick, W. St. J, F., 86, 87
Bridgman, W. C., 255-256
Bright, J., 44, 46, 48, 161, 169, 170, 171
Burns, John, 158, 261-263, 266
Butler, Sir Geoffrey, 20, 26, 57

Canning, George, 17, 21, 167
Carlyle, Thomas, 60
Carnarvon, Lord, 46
Cassel, F., 256
Catholic Emancipaton, 21
Cecil, Eustace G., 8
Cecil, Lord Hugh, 9, 10, 53
Cecil, Lord Robert, 13, 14, 15, 17, 161, 208, 263-264, 266-267, 270, 272-274, 276-277, 281-284, 288-290, 299-304
Chamberlain, Austen, 254-255, 285
Chamberlain, Joseph, 8, 89, 94, 112, 113-117, 123, 126, 132, 134, 137, 151, 160, 164, 165, 178, 192, 214, 215, 236, 237
Chamberlain, Neville, 267-268
Chartists, 42, 167
Chaplin Committee, 238-239
Chelmsford, Lord, 177
Churchill, Lady Randolph, 72
Churchill, Lord Randolph, 8, 9, 12-13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, inherits Disraelian legacy, 62-66; first evidence of Tory Democracy, 67-70; and the Fourth Party, 71, 78, 79-81; and Reform Bill of 1884, 83-88; and National Union of Conservative Associations, 92-96; attacked by the reactionary Tory press, 96-98; his influence on the party, 143, 145-151; and Joseph Chamberlain, 115-116; Chancellor of the Exchequer, 117; and the Dartford programme, 117-120; his resignation, 121-137; on public economy, 138-140; on political and social reforms, 140-159; and tariff reform, 240-241n; 182, 184, 185, 194, 203, 204, 205, 207, 209, 212, 213, 227, 234, 246-247, 248, 250, 252
Churchill, W. S., 15, 85, 100, 113, 122, 125, 151, 247, 282-283
Cobden, R., 161, 171-172
Coningsby, 31, 33, 34, 138, 297
Contarini Fleming, 31, 33
Cosby, Dudley S. A., 249
Cross, R., 177, 179-180, 191
Curzon, Earl, 100, 288

Dartford programme, 12, 100, 115, 117-120, 126, 203, 205

De Morgan's address to Lord Beaconsfield, 25
Devonshire, Duke of, 241
Dicey, A. V., 22-23, 32
Dilke, Sir Charles, 67
Disraeli, B., 11, 12-13, 14, 16, 17, and Bolingbroke, 19-20; 21, 23, educated his party, 24-25, devotion to Constitution, 27; opposed by old Tories, 27-28; and young Tories, 28-29; his novels, 31-34; his speeches, 34-42; and trade unionism, 37; and the Ten Hours' Bill, 37; and Manchester speech, 38-39; and *Sanitas Sanitatum*, 39; and Crystal Palace speech, 39-41; and middle-class domination, 40-41; and Reform Bill of 1832, 41-42; and Chartists, 42-43; and Reform Bill of 1867, 43-48; and democracy, 48-51; and the Conservative workingman, 51-53; and election of 1868, 53-54; and election of 1874, 54; and Ireland, 56; and House of Commons, 56; and woman suffrage, 57; and foreign affairs, 58; and the monarchy, 59; his legacy, 58-60; 62, 64, 65, 66, 74, 77, 79, 80, 85, 87, 89, 90, 91, 94, 105, 135, 137, 138, 143, 144, 153, 161, 167, 168, 172, 184, 199, 203, 207, 215, 223, 234, 248, 249, 250, 252, 267
Dunraven, Lord, 18, 123, 154, 185, 186, 198, 214, 216, 287

Education, 36, 55, 118, 140-141, 215-222
Egypt, 69-70, 296
Elcho, Lord, 36, 174
Election of 1880, 69
Endymion, 21
England's Trust, 30
Evans, L. Worthington, 255, 256, 257, 258n

Forster, A. W., 254, 256
Forwood, 2
Fourth Party, 71-72, 73, 75, 89-91, 92, 103

Gardiner, A. G., 56
George, Lloyd, 236, 237, 252, 254, 255, 256, 270, 275, 278, 279, 281, 290
Gladstone, W. E., 8, 46, 50, 69n, 79, 82, 100, 110n, 168, 171-172
Glenesk, Lord, 84
Gore, Ormsby, 57, 291-292, 299
Gorst, Harold, 60, 69, 71, 74, 79
Gorst, Sir John, 12, 14, 16, 71, 73, 75-79, 80, 82, 90, 91, 93, 99, 103, 105, 136, 164, 182, 190, 195, 198-200, 203-204, 219, 220-221, 222-225, 233, 236, 239, 243, 244, 246, 250
Goschen, G. J., (first Viscount), 112, 126, 139
Goulding, E. A., 257, 258n
Graham, Sir James, 168
Grayson, Victor, 162
Greenwood, Sir Hamar, 208, 277, 280, 281
Gretton, R. H., 237

Hamilton, Lord Claude, 88
Hartington, Lord, 112, 113, 144
Hicks-Beach, Sir Michael, 68, 102
Hobhouse, L. T., 170
Holland, Lionel, 123
Home Rule, 107-111, 115
Hope, J. F., 218, 257
House of Commons, 289-291
House of Lords, 285-288
Housing, 39, 155-156, 176, 227-233, 242-243, 259-268
Huskisson, William, 21, 167
Hyndman, H. M., 158

India, 131, 253, 296-297
Ireland, 56, 68, 86-87, 97, 104-111, 118, 127, 143, 144-151, 207-215, 259, 276-285

Jackson, Andrew, 129
James, Sir Henry, 78
Jennings, L. J., 105, 132, 158
Jeyes, S. H., 124

Kebbel, T. E., 8, 13

Labouchere, H. D., 7, 15, 88, 93, 126, 149
Labour Party, 16, 59
Lampson, G. Locker, 255, 256
Land reform, 205
Lang, Leslie H., 234n
Lansdowne, Earl of, 214, 262, 285-286
Law, Bonar, 15, 19, 160, 161, 235, 236, 239, 251, 257, 299

Lawson, Sir Wilfrid, 158
Liberal Unionists, 164
Lincoln, Abraham, 58
Lloyd, Sir George, 292
Long, Walter, 200
Low, Sidney, 234-235
Lowe, Robert, 46
Lucy, Sir Henry, 72
Lyttelton, Alfred, 161, 185, 186, 259, 268, 298-299

Maamtrasna affair, 107
McCarthy, Justin, 79, 117, 123, 135, 151, 169, 222
McCartney, J. W. E., 88
Macdonald, A., 162
MacDonald, Ramsay, 165, 200
Mackintosh, A., 65
Manchester School, 11, 167, 170
Manners, Lord John, 29, 30, 36, 168
Mansbridge, Alfred, 216
Marlborough, Duchess of, 75
Marlborough, Duke of, 11n
Marriott, Sir John, 58
Matthews, H., 186
Midland Conservative Club, 94
Mill, John Stuart, 24
Milner, Viscount, 17, 248, 268, 271, 295-298
Morley, Viscount, 113, 122, 134, 158
Morning Post, 198n, 248, 253
Moseley, Oswald, 208, 277, 281
Muir, R., 169, 177, 184
Mundella, A. J., 179, 184

National Union of Conservative Associations, 92-95
Newton, Lord, 285, 288
Northcote, Sir Stafford, 63, 64, 72, 78, 81, 89, 90, 91, 95, 102

Oastler, Richard, 12, 22, 166, 169, 170n, 223
O'Connell, Daniel, 21
O'Connor, T. P., 20, 49, 110
Old-age pensions, 235-239, 253
Osborne, Lord Sydney, 185
Ostrogorski, M., 77

Parnell, C. S., 111, 148, 211
Peel, Sir Robert, 9, 17, 21, 22, 23, 129, 167, 168, 234
Physical deterioration, 241-245
Pigott affair, 148-151
Pitt, William, 17, 20, 21, 44, 87, 234
Plain Tory, 7
Plimsoll, S., 180-182
Primrose Day, 59
Primrose League, 31, 74, 75, 102

Redmond, John, 211, 212, 213, 214
Reform Bill of 1832, 41-42; of 1867, 43-48; of 1884, 9, 81-89
Ridley, Sir Matthew, W., 192
Ritchie, C. T., 187, 204
Roberts, Harry, 251
Rose, F. H., 170
Roseberry, Lord, 8, 9, 102, 113, 132, 247
Rothschild Committee, 237
Russell, Lord John (1st Earl), 42, 45
Russia, 69n
Rutland, Duke of, 29

Sackville, Lord, 152
Sadler, Michael, 12, 22, 162, 223
Salisbury, Marquis of, 28, 45, 46, 66, 69, 72, 73, 88, 91, 95, 96, 100, 102, 117, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 135, 158, 184, 191, 192, 205, 229, 231, 237
Salmon, Mr., 113
Sanitas Sanitatum, 39, 154, 176, 225, 267
Sankey Commission, 270
Shaftesbury, Earl of, 12, 22, 47, 162, 166, 169, 172, 173, 174, 176, 180, 224
Short Hours Association, 37
Slack, J. B., 245
Smith, F. E., (Lord Birkenhead), 65, 113, 208, 251, 284, 287
Smith, W. H., 78, 86, 120
South Africa, 70, 71
Spectator, The, 293
Sweating, 154, 157, 184, 185, 268, 269, 298
Sybil, 12, 31-33, 34, 138, 167, 176, 297
Strachey, J. St Loe, 293-295
Smythe, George, 29

Tancred, 31
Tariff Reform, 201, 240, 241
Taylor, G. R. S., 162
Taylor, Kyffin, 260
Temperance, 154, 157-158, 204, 298
Thomas, J. H., 69n

Tillett, Ben, 163
Torrens, W. T. M., 176
Tory Democracy, definition of, 7; and opportunism, 9-11; and social reform, 13, 163-164; and political reform, 14; a vitalizing force, 11-12, 245-247
Trade Unionism, 37

Unemployment, 198, 275, 276

Versailles Treaty, 297
Vivian, Herbert, 16, 65, 73
Vivian Grey, 49

Ware, Sir Fabian, 246
West, Sir Algernon, 110
Wharncliffe, Lord, 167
Wilberforce, William, 22
Winchelsea, Lord, 29
Wood, E., 290, 292, 293
Wood, Maurice, 251
Wolff, Sir Henry Drummond, 70, 71, 73, 74, 79, 82, 105
Woman Suffrage, 299, 300
Workingmen, 11, 51-56, 59, 93, 154, 245n
Wyndham, G., 214, 299
Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armaments, 304
Washington Labour Conference, 303

Young England, 29-31, 75, 172

329.942
W659

RAYMOND H. FOGLER LIBRARY
DATE DUE
MAY 15 1969
DEC 7 1969
MAY 21 1976

UNIV OF MAINE
3 7550 00888511 4